

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

March, 1956

| | |
|---|----|
| WILLIAM H. CLARK. <i>Wieland and Winckelmann: Saul and the Prophet</i> | 1 |
| RAPHAEL LEVY. <i>The Medieval Proverb "nate que nate"</i> | 17 |
| M. E. PORTER and J. H. BALTZELL. <i>The Medieval French Lives of Saint Fiacre</i> | 21 |
| ROBERT NUGENT. <i>Baudelaire and His French Critics, 1868-1881</i> | 28 |
| NORMAN NATHAN. <i>Pronouns of Address in the 'Friar's Tale'</i> | 39 |
| PAUL A. JORGENSEN. <i>Alien Military Doctrine in Renaissance England</i> | 43 |
| CARL R. WOODRING. <i>The Aims, Audience, and Structure of the Drapier's Fourth Letter</i> | 50 |
| VAN AKIN BURD. <i>Ruskin's Quest for a Theory of Imagination</i> | 60 |
| REVIEWS | 73 |
| BOOKS RECEIVED | 91 |

Volume Seventeen

Number One

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESS
SEATTLE

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Edited by

EDWARD GODFREY COX
Managing Editor

EMILY E. JOHNSON
Editorial Associate

DUDLEY D. GRIFFITH

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

ABRAHAM C. KELLER

Direct Contributions and Business Correspondence to
Managing Editor, Modern Language Quarterly
Parrington Hall
University of Washington
Seattle 5

Subscription price \$3.50 per year • Single copies \$1.00
Issued in March, June, September, December

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*

Entered as second-class matter May 6, 1940, at the post office at Seattle, Washington,
under the Act of March 3, 1879

PRINTED IN U. S. A.





MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Volume Seventeen

March, 1956

Number One

ARTICLES

| | |
|---|----|
| William H. Clark. Wieland and Winckelmann: Saul and the Prophet | 1 |
| Raphael Levy. The Medieval Proverb <i>nate que nate</i> | 17 |
| M. E. Porter and J. H. Baltzell. The Medieval French Lives of Saint Fiacre | 21 |
| Robert Nugent. Baudelaire and His French Critics, 1868-1881 | 28 |
| Norman Nathan. Pronouns of Address in the "Friar's Tale" | 39 |
| Paul A. Jorgensen. Alien Military Doctrine in Renaissance England | 43 |
| Carl R. Woodring. The Aims, Audience, and Structure of the Drapier's Fourth Letter | 50 |
| Van Akin Burd. Ruskin's Quest for a Theory of Imagination | 60 |

REVIEWS

| | |
|--|----|
| Nathan Comfort Starr. King Arthur Today: The Arthurian Legend in English and American Literature, 1901-1953 [Robert W. Ackerman] | 73 |
| Don M. Wolfe (editor). Complete Prose Works of John Milton. Vol. I: 1624-1642 [Allen R. Benham] | 74 |
| Benjamin B. Hoover. Samuel Johnson's Parliamentary Reporting [Benjamin Boyce] | 75 |
| M. H. Abrams. The Mirror and the Lamp [Malcolm Brown] | 76 |
| Roger Asselineau. L'Évolution de Walt Whitman [Harold Blodgett] | 77 |
| James Kinsley (editor). Scottish Poetry: A Critical Survey [DeLancey Ferguson] | 79 |
| Carl F. Bayerschmidt and Lee M. Hollander (translators). Njáls Saga [P. M. Mitchell] | 80 |
| L. A. Triebel. Rasser of Alsace [Wolfgang F. Michael] | 81 |
| Frederick Hiebel. Novalis: German Poet—European Thinker—Christian Mystic [Henry Hatfield] | 83 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Seymour L. Flaxman. Herman Heijermans and His Dramas [<i>Marten ten Hoor</i>] | 83 |
| Rudolf Majut. Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß. II. Teil: Geschichte des deutschen Romans vom Biedermeier bis zur Gegenwart [<i>Wolfgang Paulsen</i>] | 85 |
| Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Germanischen Philologie, Neue Folge, Vols. XVI-XIX: Bibliographie, 1936-1939 [<i>Curtis C. D. Vail</i>] | 87 |
| Ulrich Leo. Rómulo Gallegos: Estudio sobre el arte de novelar [<i>Gloria Aledort</i>] | 87 |
| Henry W. Hoge (editor). Lope de Vega: <i>El príncipe despeñado</i> [<i>R. W. Tyler</i>] | 89 |
| Books Received | 91 |

WIELAND AND WINCKELMANN: SAUL AND THE PROPHET

By WILLIAM H. CLARK

Wieland once said that "in the chorus of the philhellenists" he felt somewhat like Saul among the prophets.¹ These words were written in 1798, at the height of the German reverence for Greek antiquity, when Wieland himself felt removed from the main stream of literary activity. He had gone through many stages in order to arrive at this point. Yet during part of his residence in Switzerland (1752-1760) Wieland, in one of these "stages," seems to have embraced enthusiastically the ideal of Greek art and life that was essential to the classicism of Goethe and Schiller—the ideal of Winckelmann. The purpose of the present article is to reexamine the evidence of Wieland's early reaction to Winckelmann's ideas and to indicate something of their significance in Wieland's development as a writer.

The influence of Winckelmann's writings upon his immediate contemporaries was deep and wide. A detailed study of the reception of his ideas in Germany is to be found in Henry Hatfield's work of 1943.² Hatfield presents an essentially accurate version of Wieland's mature judgment on Winckelmann: Wieland admired Winckelmann although he criticized him mildly, and he accepted "noble simplicity and quiet grandeur" as valid critical standards.

It is quite true, as Hatfield writes, that Wieland's works with a Greek setting do not generally reflect any influence of Winckelmann. One can find traces of such an influence, however, in other writings by Wieland. The chief difficulty is that the period of his life when Winckelmann's influence was the strongest was also the time when Wieland was leading, in the words of Friedrich Sengle, a literary double life.³ Between his "great transformation" of 1756, when he renounced his "Platonic" and "seraphic" attitudes, and the appearance of *Araspes und Panthea* shortly before his departure from Switzerland in 1760, Wieland's published work gave little indication of his true state of mind. It is only when the available documents of this period are very closely examined that the leading motif in them becomes apparent: not a sentimentalized Christianity (the "seraphic") nor an idealistic preaching of virtue (the "Platonic"), but rather the idealized Hellas of noble simplicity and quiet grandeur proclaimed by Winckelmann in 1755.⁴

¹ *Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen*, ed. Karl Wilhelm Böttiger (Leipzig, 1838), II, 178 (letter to K. A. Böttiger, July 10, 1798).

² Henry Hatfield, *Winckelmann and His German Critics, 1755-1781: A Prelude to the Classical Age* (New York, 1943).

³ Friedrich Sengle, *Wieland* (Stuttgart, 1949), pp. 97 ff.

⁴ *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst*, text of 1755 in *Das Erbe der Alten*, Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Klassik, Bd. I, ed. Emil Ermatinger (Leipzig, 1935), pp. 31-61. Cited hereafter as *Gedanken*.

Literary historians have taken little notice of this characteristic of Wieland's production from 1756 to 1760, and it is one of Sengle's many merits that he has made a special point of it in his excellent biography. The posture of ideal Hellenism was a transitional one for Wieland, an enthusiasm which he soon abandoned; but it must be examined and understood if we are to understand the whole Wieland. It may be true, as Hatfield says, that Wieland nowhere expressed belief in Winckelmann's dogmas as a whole. But at any rate, in the period we are considering Wieland did approach wholehearted approval of Winckelmann's dogmas more closely than at any other time of his life—perhaps as closely as possible for one of his temperament. His rapid falling away after 1760 does not constitute a convincing contrary argument, as young Wieland was notorious for being easily fired with soon-dying enthusiasms.

Speaking of the wide spread of Winckelmann's ideas and their application to fields other than that of art criticism, Hatfield points out that "'noble simplicity,' the most effective of Winckelmann's slogans, became to Wieland and Sulzer a moral as well as an aesthetic concept."⁸ This is true enough; but the curious thing is that Wieland himself actually used the term, in a moral sense, in a work published years before Winckelmann came upon the scene. On this score Wieland had nothing to learn from Winckelmann, though he may have greeted Winckelmann's application of the concept to aesthetics as a new thing. Wieland's early use of the term suggests, however, that there may have been elements in his development up to 1755 which would make him especially receptive to Winckelmann's ideas.

"Noble simplicity" had been present as a fairly clear concept in Wieland's mind long before he found the term in Winckelmann. Wieland too had derived this ideal from his acquaintance with ancient Greece, though certainly with no reference to ancient art nor primarily to ancient literature as such. He came to it through his enthusiasm for Greek philosophy, which indeed was the avenue by which he first approached the Greeks at all. Wieland wrote in a footnote to his *Moralische Briefe* (1752) that Plato, with his "extravagant disposition," had not been satisfied with the "noble simplicity" (*edle Einfalt*) of Socrates' teaching.⁹ From the development of Wieland's personal moral philosophy up to 1752, it is quite clear that Socrates' ethical teachings were very important to him at that time. Xenophon's account of these teachings, he felt, appropriately reflected their "noble simplicity."

"Quiet grandeur" is quite another matter. Wieland simply had no

⁸ Hatfield, p. 147.

⁹ *Wielands Gesammelte Schriften*, hrsg. von der Deutschen Kommission der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Erste Abteilung, *Werke*, I, 289. This group of volumes in the Academy edition will be cited hereafter as *Werke* in the notes; volume and page references to Wieland in the text will also be to this edition.

taïste for the monumental. In the presence of true greatness he might become sentimentally enthusiastic; for the pretense of greatness, as for any pretense, he held ready the weapon of satire. But out of his own personality it was not likely that he would arrive independently at an ideal of quiet grandeur, or independently develop a style of writing that would express such an ideal. Under Winckelmann's influence he did attempt to cultivate such a style, but he did not succeed in making it his own.

To some extent, however, Wieland was prepared for the "calmness" of the grandeur. He frequently spoke of "tranquillity of mind" (*Seelenruhe*) in his works as a youthful philosopher. In *Die Natur der Dinge* (1751) he attributed this quality to Epicurus, seeming to consider the latter's doctrine of *ataraxia* as the foundation of happiness (I, 19). In the *Moralische Briefe* of 1752 he seemed to ascribe the idea of *Seelenruhe* chiefly to the Stoics, including Epictetus and Seneca (I, 263, 265, 278). At a time nearer the critical spring of 1755 when the *Gedanken* appeared, he wrote in his narrative poem "Cidli" of *fröhliche Ruh* (v. 72) and *ruhige Großmut* (v. 78); and in "Die sterbende Rahel" of the same period there is a rather Laokoon-like passage:

Hätte nicht eine göttliche Kraft die sterbende Rahel
Mächtig gestärkt, sie wäre den Trauerszenen erlegen.
Aber mit mehr als menschlicher Tugend, mit heiterer Seele
Blieb sie von Seufzern und Tränen umgeben in duldender Stille.⁷
(vv. 111-14)

In contrast to his negative criticism of Plato in 1752 is Wieland's extreme enthusiasm in the next few years (1752-1756). *Theages* (1755), the theme of which is the harmonious combination of virtue and beauty, gives perhaps the most revealing view of his "Platonism." Thus his occupation with Plato furnished a background well suited to the reception of the ideals of *edle Einfalt und stille Größe*; negatively in the concept of Socrates' noble simplicity, positively in the sublimity of Plato's poetic vision.

To a large extent, calling his attitude "Platonism" is only giving a name to the general exalted moral enthusiasm which was to be observed in Wieland's very earliest work. He used the term later to signify misguided zeal (*Schwärmerei*), both metaphysical and ethical. In his earlier disillusion with metaphysics it had been the idealism of Plato he had in mind; and now his moral idealism, before the inevitable crisis and disillusion, is for a time "Platonic." Although it may seem too facile an explanation, it is still an attractive possibility that Wieland's idealism, after its shipwreck in the moral and

⁷ Both poems in *Werke*, II, 254-63. Written not later than February, 1755; originally published in *Fragmente in der erzählenden Dichtart* (Zurich, 1755) along with other contributions by Wieland and Bodmer. The spelling of the original has been modernized.

metaphysical fields, was for a time channeled into the artistic and aesthetic under the influence of Winckelmann.*

To Wieland's long-standing admiration for Plato had recently been added an enthusiasm for Shaftesbury. It is difficult to determine the exact time when this enthusiasm began. But very early, through his reading of the English moral weeklies and Hagedorn, he had entered Shaftesbury's sphere of influence. It seems that he first read the Englishman in Bodmer's library, after 1752. Wieland's first work to show this influence is his *Gespräch des Sokrates mit Timoclea* (begun 1754; finished April, 1755), in which he was consciously trying to present ideas of Plato and Shaftesbury, through their common literary form of the dialogue. Shaftesbury's (and Plato's) influence is more pronounced in *Theages* (written in the spring of 1755).⁹ Here Shaftesbury's special meaning for Wieland is indicated clearly. The fictitious narrator in this work is "a virtuoso according to Shaftesbury's conception of the term" (II, 424). Wieland believed he found in Shaftesbury's "virtuoso" the equivalent of Plato's and Xenophon's ideal of *kalos kai agathos* ("beautiful and good"): a humanistic ideal of the cultivated man.¹⁰ It is obvious that such a concept was in keeping with Winckelmann's aesthetic idealism. And not only this; if Wieland himself, as he later wrote to Zimmermann, in March, 1758, was "aiming at the character of Shaftesbury's virtuoso," he would welcome Winckelmann's instruction in the field of plastic art, where he himself was inexperienced (AB, I, 259).

Winckelmann's ideas, then, were likely to be received favorably by Wieland. How much do we know about the actual transmission of these ideas? Unfortunately we have very little direct evidence and must rely upon inferences. My own impression is that he must have read Winckelmann early, carefully, and enthusiastically. If one does assume this, it is still not clear how early and under what circumstances. Wieland's correspondence gives no such detailed information. In his letters to Zimmermann, Wieland seems to be taking Winckelmann's standards for granted; we may assume knowledge of Winckelmann on the part of both men. Discussion of Winckelmann was perhaps more likely to be carried on in personal conversations than in writing.

The probability of Wieland's early acquaintance with the *Gedanken*

* See his letter of 1758 to Zimmermann in *Ausgewählte Briefe von C. M. Wieland an verschiedene Freunde* (Zurich, 1815-1816), I, 259, 261. Cited hereafter as AB.

⁹ Sengle, pp. 22, 35, 56. Bernhard Seuffert, *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe*, in *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, II (1904), 46, 50; VII (1921), 12. Cited hereafter as *Prolegomena*.

¹⁰ Ermatinger has a happy phrase for it: "That highest kind of cultivation whose beautiful exterior is the harmonious expression of inner nobility of soul." Emil Ermatinger, *Die Weltanschauung des jungen Wieland* (Frauenfeld, 1907), p. 138.

is enhanced, however, by the circumstances of his literary life in Zurich. When the *Gedanken* appeared in the spring of 1755, Wieland was still ostensibly a disciple of Bodmer and Breitinger. In his constant feuding with Gottsched's Leipzig group, Bodmer surely made it his business to take notice of any new developments in the literary field, and especially of any pronouncements from the opposite camp. It may not have gone unnoticed in Zurich, therefore, that Gottsched had written a review of the *Gedanken*. In the following year, 1756, Gottsched also took notice of Winckelmann's follow-up of the earlier essay: the *Sendschreiben über die Gedanken von der Nachahmung*, a publicity device designed to arouse discussion in critical circles.¹¹ Nicolai and Mendelssohn also reviewed Winckelmann's early work soon after its publication.¹²

A more important link between Winckelmann and the Swiss critics, however, was the aesthetician Johann Georg Sulzer. A member of the Berlin Academy since 1750, Sulzer was the Bodmer party's chief representative in the North; in 1756 he was to invite Wieland to collaborate in his *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste* (1771-1774), to which the poet contributed the article "Naiv" and probably the article "Hirtengedicht."¹³ Sulzer personally prepared a French translation of the *Gedanken* on the basis of the original edition of 1755.¹⁴ A further measure of his interest in Winckelmann is his attempt a few years later to have the antiquarian called to a position in Berlin.¹⁵ It seems quite probable that Bodmer and his supporters would have had early news of Winckelmann's work from Sulzer, if from no other source.

Turning to Wieland's private life, we are again faced with the necessity of speculation. Here a very important unknown quantity is the relation between him and the young Salomon Gessner. If we could know something of Wieland's conversations with Gessner, we might clear up a great deal about his early reaction to Winckelmann.

Some facts are known about the course of this relationship. At the beginning of Wieland's stay in Zurich, Gessner was inclined to ridicule the inexperienced and overly bookish poet; in this opinion he was not alone. This remained the state of affairs until December, 1754, when a real friendship sprang up between the two.¹⁶ It must not be forgotten, of course, that the firm in which Gessner's family had an interest published Wieland's works while he was in Switzer-

¹¹ Hatfield describes the first review as "complimentary but not uncritical" (p. 21). The two reviews appeared in Gottsched's journal *Das Neueste aus der anmuthigen Gelehrsamkeit* (1755), pp. 537-44; (1756), pp. 839-68.

¹² Hatfield, pp. 22, 24.

¹³ *Prolegomena*, II, 51; VI (1909), 107.

¹⁴ J. J. Winckelmanns *Kleine Schriften und Briefe*, ed. Hermann Uhde-Bernays (Leipzig, 1925), II, 148, 178; Carl Justi, *Winckelmann und seine Zeitgenossen*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1923), I, 460.

¹⁵ Justi, III, 323 ff.; Hatfield, pp. 131 ff.

¹⁶ Fritz Bergemann, *Salomon Gessner: eine literarisch-biographische Einleitung* (Munich, 1913), p. 63.

land and for some time thereafter. Further significant items of information regarding the Gessner-Wieland friendship have been brought together by Sengle, who also deplores the scantiness of the evidence but assumes that the relationship must have been closer, especially around the critical year 1755, than has been realized hitherto. Forty years later, when his own daughter Charlotte became engaged to Heinrich Gessner, Wieland recalled happy hours spent with her fiancé's father "in the years '53, '54, '55 etc."¹⁷ These dates must be extended forward, probably to the very end of Wieland's stay in Zurich (June, 1759). We know, for instance, of a vacation in the mountains in early July, 1757, which Wieland spent in the company of Bodmer, Breitinger, and Gessner.¹⁸ I am not suggesting that Gessner may have directed Wieland's attention to Winckelmann. It is sufficient for us that Gessner was an artist, and that his friendship brought Wieland into personal contact with a group of people with wide intellectual and artistic interests,¹⁹ who were also admirers of Winckelmann.

Most of the correspondence between Winckelmann and his Swiss friends dates from a time after Wieland's departure from Zurich. The origin of this correspondence, however, suggests that it was almost impossible for Wieland, living in Zurich when the *Gedanken* appeared, to escape being exposed to lively discussion about the work.

The story begins in Paris, where the German engraver Johann Georg Wille had commissioned a French translation of the *Gedanken*. Winckelmann's friend, the painter Dietrich, in 1755 sent a copy to Wille, who then arranged to have a translation made.²⁰ Winckelmann was a great admirer of Wille's work, and it was not long before a correspondence grew up between them. Toward the end of 1757 Winckelmann expressed to the engraver some fears as to his financial and personal security. These fears later proved to be groundless, but Wille took the information seriously and passed it on to another correspondent of his, Hans Caspar Füessli, in Zurich.²¹ Füessli collected and sent to Winckelmann a gift of money which reached him at Naples in April, 1758.²² Winckelmann expressed his gratitude at once and continued to show it.²³

Hans Caspar Füessli was no unimportant personage in the intellectual and artistic life of Zurich. The family had a tradition of artistic talent. Hans Caspar himself had spent part of his early life in Vienna, where he had gained some reputation as a painter, and had returned

¹⁷ Sengle, pp. 79-80; AB, IV, 40 f.

¹⁸ Bergemann, p. 69. Sengle (p. 99) mentions this trip but not the names of Wieland's companions.

¹⁹ Sengle considers Wieland's acquaintance with this group a very important factor in his approach to the Hellenism of Winckelmann (p. 101).

²⁰ Justi, I, 460.

²¹ Justi, III, 51, 55 ff.

²² Very shortly before this a traveling companion had delighted Winckelmann by reciting passages from Salomon Gessner's *Idyllen* (Justi, III, 56 f.; II, 255).

²³ Justi, III, 111 ff.

to Zurich in 1746. He was possibly the prototype for the title character in Wieland's *Theages*, written in the same year (1755) when the first volume of Füessli's book *Geschichte und Abbildung der besten Maler in der Schweiz* appeared.²⁴ His house in Zurich had become a gathering place for those interested in the fine arts. Wieland undoubtedly visited this hospitable home with Salomon Gessner, in whose father's business Füessli had an interest. The members of Füessli's circle who contributed to the gift for Winckelmann must have had a lively interest in his work, which they could know only through the writings of 1755 and 1756. Thus it is hard to see how Wieland could have missed knowing about the subscription, or could have been unaware of Winckelmann's early work. We should not expect to find documentary evidence on this point, since Wieland was living with the persons involved and correspondence with them about Winckelmann would be most unlikely.

In Wieland's polemical article of 1755, the *Ankündigung einer Dunciade für die Deutschen*, there can be found either a reflection or a presentiment of Winckelmann's themes. This *Ankündigung* was begun in 1754 but not finished until May, 1755; accordingly, we might even infer that Wieland had read Winckelmann in the spring of 1755. Here is Wieland's parallel to Winckelmann's opening sentence: "We know what a great impression the writings of Plato, the tragedies of Sophocles, the sublime hymns of Pindar, the orations of Demosthenes, and the songs of Homer . . . made upon the Greeks, among whom genuine and refined taste in all works of intellect and art . . . was so general" (IV, 84).²⁵ Further on the same point: "Contempt for the ancient, genuine source of wisdom, morality, taste, and eloquence has always resulted in the decay of knowledge. If this is the case with us, then we are rapidly retrogressing into . . . barbarism" (IV, 128). Wieland also praised "Greek taste" in the *Gespräch des Sokrates mit Timoclea*, already mentioned: "We know that the Greeks' taste in women's adornment was as refined as it was in all other matters" (II, 263).

Other writings later in 1755 seem to point more plausibly to an acquaintance with Winckelmann's *Gedanken*. Even the *Sympathien* (1756; completed before November, 1755), certainly a "seraphic" production, contains such indications:

Beauty is a promise which the soul makes that it will be great, noble, and worthy of emulation. (II, 450)

Your mind has been formed by intimate association with the wise men of a brilliant age; they have made you acquainted with Nature, and have discovered to you the innermost springs of the human heart. From them you have imbibed the refined taste that is able to examine what is true and good, to unite them and to express them in [your] own ideas and feelings. (II, 480)

²⁴ Sengle, p. 101.

²⁵ *Gedanken*, p. 31: "Good taste, which is being propagated more and more throughout the world, had its first beginnings under the Greek sky."

More direct, it seems, is the relationship to Winckelmann expressed in Wieland's *Plan einer Academie*, begun in November, 1755, and completed in July, 1756.²⁶ Wieland begins with the statement that in order to be "practical" in his suggestions for the improvement of education, he will "ask the advice of the ancient Greeks, who as is well known are as superior to us in this respect as in most others, and to whom we should rightly look as our teachers in such matters" (IV, 183). Then follows a sketch of Greek education, the aim of which Wieland considered to have been the implanting of *kalo-kagathia* or the quality of the "virtuoso": a liberal education with a practical purpose. "The Greeks demanded of a noble and well-bred youth that he be *kalos kai agathos*; as Shaftesbury, the cleverest and most polished of all modern writers, expresses it, a virtuoso" (IV, 188). He defines this character as follows:

A man whom the Muses and Graces have educated, a lover of nature and art; who knows the masterpieces of human intellect and skill; who knows how to value every skill and every talent; who has studied the world—the character, constitution, laws, customs, religions, arts, and inventions of the various nations—and who knows what is just and beautiful in all of these.

Such men were not rare in Greece. Wieland explains: "A great general or a great orator was not the common thing; but to be a virtuoso was nothing unusual. It was a result of their education." From this rather glowing description of Greek education Wieland draws a very interesting conclusion: if we admit that this character was the natural product of such education, it is easy to see why we can observe in the personages of antiquity and in the statues representing them "a certain atmosphere of greatness, along with a noble simplicity and unaffected elegance."²⁷ Enter Winckelmann!

An earlier passage in the essay had also been reminiscent of Winckelmann's conception of Greece:

No nation has developed [the fine arts] to such a high degree [as the Greeks. The painters] of modern times, just like the Miltons, the Thomsons, the Corneilles, and the Racines, have been able to conceive no prouder thought, attain no higher flight than to imitate the ancients; they studied them as diligently as they studied Nature itself; and they have hardly approached them in genius and art. . . . The universal good taste of the Greeks furthered the perfection of the fine arts, just as it was in turn formed by the works of art. (IV, 187 f.)

The autumn of 1756 marked the end of Wieland's intellectual dependence upon Bodmer and the beginning of his inner conversion. In our context it seems significant that the two works we know he

²⁶ *Plan einer Academie zu* [sic] *Bildung des Verstandes und des Herzens junger Leute*, Werke, IV, 183-206. Published in 1758, a revision of a plan submitted in 1756 for a *Ritterakademie* planned by the Margrave of Baden. I am not clear as to whether the Academy edition follows the manuscript of 1756 or the published text of 1758. Seuffert planned for the latter (*Prolegomena*, II, 76). I am assuming the two versions are substantially the same.

²⁷ Werke, IV, 188 f.: "ein gewisses *Air de grandeur* . . . mit einer edeln Simplicität und ungezwungenen Eleganz."

began at that time were in a sense "imitation of the ancients": *Araspes und Panthea* (not completed until April, 1760) and a translation of two odes of Pindar, of which nothing has been preserved.²⁸

The year 1757, then, was the time when we might expect Wieland to show clearly his approach to the new view of Greece. Inwardly the ties with his "seraphic" poetry and Bodmer's patriarchal poetry were completely broken. Indeed the epic poem *Cyrus*, which Wieland began in the spring of that year, is the most convincing proof of his attempt to exemplify such an ideal. He produced very little for publication in 1757, however, and we must look elsewhere for signs of a real influence of Winckelmann.

In an indirect way, however, two of the published works of 1757 and 1758 do point to the fact that Wieland was already affected by Winckelmann. In one of them, his "Ode zum dankbaren Andenken eines Erlauchten und Verdienstvollen Staatsmanns in der Republick Zürich," Wieland speaks of the deceased's "noble simplicity" and "sublime humility."²⁹ In another occasional poem, "Auf das Bildniß des Königs von Preußen von Herrn Wille" (1758), the connection is less apparent. Professor Sulzer had encouraged Wieland in July, 1757, to write poems about Frederick II, and for about two weeks during the month of August the young poet had in his possession a copy of Wille's portrait-engraving of the king.³⁰ This was, of course, the same Wille who a few months later was to write Caspar Füessli and thus set off the famous correspondence. The poem itself is insignificant, but the circumstances of its composition point again to Wieland's connection with persons interested in Winckelmann.³¹

The most convincing evidence of Wieland's rapprochement to Winckelmann in these years appears in documents which were not intended for publication, namely, his lectures to his private pupils, preserved in their notes from his dictation and not published until many years after his death.³² Obviously they are not great works; doubtless he used the ideas of others in preparing them, and they have with good reason been generally disregarded. But as evidence of the particular relationship we are examining, they are extremely important. Wieland's adulation of the Greeks' accomplishments in

²⁸ *Prolegomena*, II, 51. We know also that Wieland was working on a translation of an Apology of Socrates, presumably Plato's, in 1758 (*ibid.*, II, 55; VI, 108). *Araspes*, based on an episode in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, is primarily an autobiographical document; no influence of Winckelmann is evident in it.

²⁹ *Wieland's Werke*, ed. Heinrich Düntzer (Berlin: Hempel, n.d.), VI, 30-35. Cited hereafter as Hempel. *Edle Einfalt* (st. 29); *erhabne Demut* (st. 32); see also stanzas 12, 17, 19-21, 25, and 31.

³⁰ *Prolegomena*, II, 53.

³¹ Hempel, VI, 36 f.

³² The first to be published was the *Geschichte der Gelehrtheit*, ed. L. Hirzel, Bibliothek älterer Schriftwerke der deutschen Schweiz, Ser. II, Heft 3 (Frauenfeld, 1891). Some others appeared in Bouvier, *Un Cahier d'élèves du précepteur Wieland* (Geneva, 1895). Others were not published until all appeared in *Werke*, IV (1916).

the arts is shown clearly in a paragraph from one of these, the *Geschichte der Gelehrtheit* (1757):

If we exclude the natural sciences, there is no branch of learning in which the ancient Greeks did not excel. . . . In all other branches of philosophy which concern men more closely, we have never surpassed the Greeks. They will always remain our masters in the art of thinking reasonably; in that kind of philosophy which ennobles our affections, controls our passions, and improves our manners; in the art of government; in eloquence; and in all the other fine arts. (IV, 244)

It was to the Greeks, Wieland said, that we owe all our modern culture, through the rehabilitation of classical learning in the Renaissance. This beneficent revolution had rescued Europe from medieval barbarism by bringing back the arts and sciences (IV, 283 f., 444 f.).

Before we turn to the details of Wieland's observations on the arts of Greece, we must first examine his use of the terms "nature" and "imitation" (*Nachahmung*). The terms themselves, of course, are peculiar neither to Wieland nor to Winckelmann, and belong to the apparatus of eighteenth-century aesthetics generally. But Wieland's usage is reminiscent of the development of similar views in Winckelmann's *Gedanken*. The poet presents the case for imitation of the ancients:

The Greek nation so excelled in poetry as well as in the other arts, that the works of their great masters will always be the most perfect models as long as men know anything of the arts, of taste, and of polite manners. It is generally agreed that the study of their works is as important as the study of nature itself—even more important—if one wishes to become acquainted with that beautiful nature from which their poets, painters, and sculptors worked. No nation has ever loved poetry more, or given the great masters more encouragement, than the Greeks; especially those of Athens, whose chief pride was in surpassing all other nations in the fine arts.³³

A slavish and puerile copying, however, must lead to poor results; it is rather the spirit of the ancients which the poet must capture. Even Virgil, whom Wieland praises in many respects, is called "nothing more than a good imitator and at times a copier" of the "original" Homer (IV, 187 f., 361 f., 369).

But what, according to Wieland, is "nature" of which the modern poet may gain a grasp through the study of Greek masterpieces? Nature, he says, is "the constitution of things, insofar as they correspond to their purpose. Thus nature is always beautiful." But things at present are not perfect, and since each one possesses beauty or perfection only to a restricted degree, we are able to conceive of a more beautiful nature in two ways: first by imagining things without their imperfections; and secondly by imagining them with a higher degree of beauty and perfection, or by constructing an ideal from the separate beauties of several different things. (IV, 339)³⁴

³³ From *Theorie und Geschichte der Red-Kunst und Dicht-Kunst* (1757), *Werke*, IV, 356.

³⁴ Cf. also p. 148 (from an essay of 1758, "Versuch eines Beweises, daß die Glückseligkeit in der Tugend liege").

Here too Wieland seems to be following Winckelmann. It is this theoretical definition of "nature" which we must keep in mind, even when Wieland speaks of "human nature"; we must remember that he is frequently speaking of an *ideal* human nature and not the empirical facts of human nature.

It is this concept of ideal human nature that in Wieland's view is fundamental to the superiority of Greek art. For "human nature is better and more beautiful in a given people, the closer their condition is to the state of nature (*Stand der Natur*)."¹ Virgil had lived in an externally refined but inwardly vicious society, whereas in Homer's day "courage, magnanimity, honesty, humanity, and reverence for the gods and for virtue in general" were common qualities. Homer knew and depicted men and women of such character (IV, 370). The essence of the argument seems to be this: the freer man is in his social relationship, the closer he will be able to approach the ideal human nature God intended him to have. Again, with Winckelmann, the emphasis on freedom. Wieland speaks elsewhere of "the original state of man, from which alone one is able to form a right concept of human nature [i.e., ideal human nature]" (IV, 586).

For the plastic arts the same principles apply. Wieland has one passage which vividly recalls the main thesis of Winckelmann's *Gedanken*:

All scholars rightly believe that the human race in general has undergone a noticeable decline in respect to its outward as well as to its inward beauty. One finds in the statues and bas-reliefs of the ancient Greeks much more beautiful figures, and in the poetical and historical works of the ancients more beautiful characters, manners, and sentiments than one nowadays generally meets with. For these reasons the rule has evolved that the poets and painters must study beautiful nature in the works of the ancients; partly because the latter had more opportunity to study nature itself, and partly because they actually had before them a more beautiful, that is, a less spoiled nature than we. (IV, 339)

Indeed not only the argument in general but also the means by which it is carried on is reminiscent of Winckelmann. In the *Gedanken*, Winckelmann says almost as much about imitation of the ancients by painters as he does about imitation by sculptors. Wieland rather slightes the sculptors, although he does mention Alcamenes, Phidias, and Praxiteles (IV, 245, 403). It is not, however, Greek painters—of whom, of course, very little was really known—to whom Wieland refers continually, but the modern European painters from Raphael on.

An interest in painting, if we may infer such an interest from the frequent references, is a new thing for the myopic Wieland. Yet perhaps it is not unrelated to his efforts to acquaint his pupils with general concepts about all the fine arts, insofar as he was able, as a part of their education as "virtuosos." A more plausible explanation is suggested by the interest in Winckelmann among Wieland's artistic acquaintances.

It is indeed possible to find a great many obvious echoes of Winckelmann in these lectures of 1757 and 1758, as well as in

Wieland's letters of the time. Wieland uses the terms "noble simplicity and quiet grandeur" for the most part in discussing literature, although he seems to consider them as relating in the first instance to the art of painting (IV, 419). He finds the qualities in question in Homer, Xenophon, Herodotus, Demosthenes, the heroes of Plutarch, and Greek sculpture and manners generally.⁸⁵

These very close similarities between Wieland's expressions and Winckelmann's ideas would be enough to establish beyond any doubt that Wieland was well aware of Winckelmann's main doctrines and gave enthusiastic approval to them. Once we are agreed on this fact, it is easy to recognize other parallels to Winckelmann in Wieland's published work of the time. On the other hand, if the lectures are left out of consideration, we are likely to miss the similarities in the works. To my mind there are obvious echoes of "noble simplicity and quiet grandeur" and of the Laokoon theme of heroic suffering in Wieland's two dramas, *Lady Johanna Gray* (begun in 1757, finished ca. June, 1758) and *Clementina von Porretta* (written 1759).⁸⁶

In *Lady Johanna Gray* the Protestant martyr is represented as a learned young woman brought up on Plato and Socrates no less than on radical Protestantism. Johanna laments the death of Edward VI with a sentimental-humanistic nostalgia:

O Tag', in stillen unbereuten Freuden,
Im Schooß der blühenden Natur, mit Dir
Mein Edward, in der heiligen Gesellschaft
Der Weisen Gräciens gelebt, o goldne Tage!
(III, i; Hempel, XL, 163)

But the most remarkable thing is that in spite of the general atmosphere of sentimentality, Lady Johanna's martyrdom is treated in terms strikingly reminiscent of Laokoon, Winckelmann's famous martyr of antiquity. The theme of nobility in suffering binds the two together. After the triumph of the Catholic party and the imprisonment of Lady Johanna and her family in the Tower, her husband addresses her as follows:

⁸⁵ Wieland uses the phrases both directly and indirectly, and there are many variations. The following are some (original spelling preserved; page references are to *Werke*, IV, unless otherwise indicated): "Naiveté und ungekünstelte Eleganz" in Herodotus (187); "erhabne Simplizität" of Demosthenes (318); "Wahrheit, Größe, Einfalt" in Raphael and Demosthenes (319); Homer is "erhabner, einfältiger, naiver" than Virgil (369); "stille Größe" in the heroes of Corneille, and as the ideal of painters and poets (388); "Einfalt und stille Größe der Natur" of the Greek poets, lacking in the Romans (409); "was man in der Mahlerey die stille Größe nennt" (419); "edle Simplizität und Majestät" of Glover (AB, I, 266).

⁸⁶ A careful comparison of these plays with their English sources (Nicholas Rowe, *Lady Jane Gray*; Samuel Richardson, *History of Sir Charles Grandison*) would of course bring the assumed indebtedness to Winckelmann into even sharper focus.

Du schweigst, Johanna, hörest meinen Klagen
 Verstumend zu, und ernste Stille ruht
 In Deinem Blick; nicht eine Träne schleicht
 Von Deinen schönen Wangen. Fühlst Du denn
 Dein eignes Elend nicht? Du, deren Herz
 So schnell, so zärtlich fremde Leiden fühlet!
 Wie weintest Du auf Edwards Leiche hin!
 Und jetzt, da Dich ein eisernes Geschick
 Vom kaum bestiegen Thron in diesen Abgrund
 Von Jammer stürzt...
 Da jedes nähernde Geräusch vielleicht
 Der Fußtritt eines Todesboten ist:
 Herrscht Seelenruh' und unbewölkte Stille
 In Deiner Brust, ergießt sich sichtbarlich
 Durch Dein Gesicht und bindet Deine Zunge.

And Lady Johanna replies:

Mein Mund ist stumm, mein Auge leer an Tränen!
 Doch hier, hier, Guilford, bebt von namenlosen Leiden
 Die bange Seel' und ächzt zum Himmel auf!
 (IV, i; Hempel, XL, 176 f.)

To continue the parallel: Winckelmann's admiring statement that we all must wish to be able to bear suffering as nobly as Laokoon is fulfilled, *mutatis mutandis*, when Lord Guilford, fired by his wife's example, accepts his own martyrdom with dignity and nobility. Just before his execution, when he comes to say farewell to her, she is amazed at the change in him:

Lady Johanna. ...welch ein Trost für mich,
 In Deinen Mienen diese stille Größe
 Und Seelenruh' zu sehn!
 Lord Guilford. Wen würde nicht Dein Beispiel,
 Du Göttliche, Dir nachzueifern reizen?
 Du, Freundin, lehrtest mich, im Frühling meines Lebens
 Dem Tode kühn ins Angesicht zu schauen!
 (V, iii; Hempel, XL, 196)

The theme of nobility in suffering recurs in Wieland's other dramatic work of this period, *Clementina von Porretta*.⁸⁷ The chief characters, Clementina and Grandison, are noble sufferers; and like all the characters in the play, though unlike Winckelmann's Laokoon, they express their feelings with an effusive sentimentality. Grandison is represented as one who has stern control over his passions and always presents a calm exterior. On occasion his feelings must be indicated in a stage direction rather than in his lines.⁸⁸ By comparison the rest of the characters are insufferably talkative. But Wieland certainly was trying to convey in the two main characters the ideas

⁸⁷ Wieland had already treated it more appropriately in a sentimental *Gespräch zwischen zweyen Engeln* (1758) concerning Sir Charles Grandison's arrival in Heaven and his reunion with Clementina. This opusculum was not published until 1829 (see *Prolegomena*, II, 54; VI, 108).

⁸⁸ For instance II, iv, and II, vi (Hempel, XL, 221, 224).

of serenity, nobility, greatness of soul, and so on.³⁹ And there is among the minor characters a foil to the Laokoon theme represented in both principals: Clementina's mother appeals to the power of Virtue, which "can give us true greatness of soul that with steady courage defies both the storm of our own passions and the attacks of adverse fortune."⁴⁰ Here the very language reads like a paraphrase of Winckelmann's words on Laokoon.

Hatfield quotes four letters from Wieland to Zimmermann, during the period we are considering, as evidence that Wieland accepted "noble simplicity" as a standard for literary criticism.⁴¹ It is significant that in the context of almost all of them Wieland is speaking of himself as a "poetischer Maler" and in one of them, a letter of April, 1758, uses the names of painters as exemplars of the particular characteristics a poet should have (AB, I, 266). And it is surely important that in the same letters—sometimes in the immediate context—he is discussing the progress of his *Cyrus*.⁴²

Wieland's epic poem *Cyrus*, partially complete in five cantos of the eighteen planned, appeared in 1759 after he had worked on it for two years. It is his most serious effort to "imitate antiquity" in the spirit of Winckelmann.⁴³ The theme comes from the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon, whom Wieland revered as a "Socratischer Scribent" and one of the greatest literary artists of all time.⁴⁴ The leading idea in the epic is the presentation of Cyrus as an exemplar of *kalokagathia*, as a Shaftesburian "virtuoso." Wieland wished his poem to be noble, grand, and simple, truly "classical" in Winckelmann's manner, and he took great pains in filing and polishing his verse. It represented a supreme effort on Wieland's part, this forced monumentality—and in the end it aroused no notice whatsoever.

Under these circumstances it was out of the question that the poem would be completed. But there were also other factors which led to Wieland's abandoning the project, and they are pertinent to the

³⁹ Clementina: "Ich wünschte groß zu handeln."—"Ja, ich will groß, ich will wie eine Unsterbliche handeln" (IV, ii, and V, v; Hempel, XL, 250, 265).

Jeronymo, Clementina's brother, to Grandison: "Ich bewundere die Größe Ihrer Seele. . . [Clementina] wollte nicht warten, bis Sie zurückgekommen wären. Vielleicht getraute sie sich nicht, sich in der stillen Größe zu erhalten, zu der sie sich emporgeschwungen hatte" (III, xiv; Hempel, XL, 246).

Grandison, referring to Clementina: "Welche Hoheit der Seele!"—"Ich bete die Größe Ihrer Seele an" (V, viii, V, x; Hempel, XL, 267, 269).

⁴⁰ "Wahre Größe der Seele . . . die sich mit gesetztem Mute dem Sturm der Leidenschaften und den Anfallen des Schicksals entgegenstellt" (III, iv; Hempel, XL, 236).

⁴¹ Hatfield, p. 118.

⁴² See also, with regard to "simplicity and grandeur," AB, II, 55, 72 (letters written in 1759).

⁴³ Both Sengle and Michel maintain that Winckelmann's ideal of Greece is basic to *Cyrus*. Sengle, pp. 100 ff.; Victor Michel, *C. M. Wieland: La formation et l'évolution de son esprit jusqu'en 1772* (Paris, 1938), p. 177.

⁴⁴ Winckelmann, of course, had remarked that the qualities of noble simplicity and quiet grandeur evident in the Greek statues were also characteristic of "Greek literature of the best period, the writings of Socrates' school" (*Gedanken*, p. 47).

question of his disillusionment with Winckelmann's Hellenism. It is instructive to follow Wieland's changing attitude toward this work in his letters to Zimmermann.

In the first place, he hoped to please Frederick of Prussia. In the spring of 1758 Wieland admitted that his intention was "to attract, by skill or by artifice, the attention of the King of P[russia]" (AB, I, 262). He was concerned about finding a competent person to translate the poem into French, so that the king could read it. Certainly an ambitious plan, in view of Frederick's disdain for German literature!

But even in the letter already quoted, Wieland expressed doubt that he was equal to the task. Soon afterward, in a somber mood, he wrote that he did not care much whether *Cyrus* would be translated or not, or whether the king would read it or not; he would be happy if, unlike his other works, it would be satisfactory to himself alone (AB, I, 268). A few months later he again expressed doubt that he would be able to finish the poem; and here the more serious, basic doubt reveals itself: "I am all too far below the stature of a hero to be able to depict one worthily and as he would be in real life" (AB, I, 303).

To this feeling of personal insufficiency there was finally added a disillusionment with the very idea of a hero-king. The events of Frederick's war had sobered Wieland considerably, and he wrote from Bern in September, 1759, "we detest . . . all these benefactors of the human race who show their favor toward us with grape-shot and thirty-pound cannon balls. I am so weary of this brutality that I am even beginning to hate my *Cyrus*" (AB, II, 93). Here is the seed of Wieland's later attitude toward "heroes," expressed drastically in a letter of 1767 to Zimmermann. He wanted to write a mock epic on Alexander the Great, in which he would show a hero

as he really was. The poets . . . depict for us heroes who, I am firmly convinced, have never existed. The historians . . . are no better at times; they are like novelists who, carried away by their love for the beautiful, the grand, and the miraculous, substitute *ideal* personages for the real persons they have proposed to acquaint us with. (AB, II, 292 ff.)

The human race, Wieland thought, had been more harmed than improved by these writers.

Cyrus, then, had been a disappointing labor for Wieland. Not only did his pains go unnoticed, but he had begun, if not to doubt the validity of Winckelmann's ideal, at least to doubt his own powers of realizing it poetically; and he had the suspicion that it was unreal, untruthful, to represent human beings as ideals. Yet, for purposes of publication, he upheld the ideals. He had not yet arrived at the detached skepticism so characteristic of him a few years later. In 1760, his last year in Switzerland, he was maintaining the dignity and moral character of the arts in words like these: "In Athens were shown the statues of the Graces made by Socrates himself as a young

man; they were clothed. The Graces of Socrates are a symbol of the condition of the fine arts among a civilized people, whose very amusements should have a certain quality of reserve and seriousness."⁴⁵

It should be obvious that Winckelmann's ideas meant a great deal to Wieland during the period we have been considering. The circumstances of his life in Zurich made it impossible for him to escape contact with them, and his own independent development had brought him to a point where he was singularly receptive to Winckelmann's idealism. And this influence was a most persistent one, in spite of Wieland's later skepticism. The skepticism and the persistence cannot be fully appreciated unless we accept what I hope these pages have shown: that Wieland was thoroughly and actively in sympathy with Winckelmann's message during his last years in Switzerland.

University of Rochester

⁴⁵ In *Lysias und Eubulus* (*Werke*, IV, 171). Socrates and his decorous Graces were the subject of one of Oeser's plates illustrating Winckelmann's *Gedanken* (Justi, I, 415). This is the kind of thing that Wieland would have appreciated even before reading Winckelmann.

THE MEDIEVAL PROVERB *NATE QUE NATE*

By RAPHAEL LEVY

The etymology of Old French *nache*, meaning "fesse," is **natica*, which was formed in Vulgar Latin out of Classical Latin *natis*, just as **avica* and **cutica* were formed out of Classical *avis* and *cutis*.¹ Godefroy's dictionary, V, 462a, offers many examples of Old French *nache* with the variants *naiche*, *nasche*, *nace*, *nage*, *naige*, *natege*.² This word served to denote the rump of bipeds and of certain quadrupeds, but in the sixteenth century it was eliminated by the term *fesses*.³ Nevertheless, *nache* has been revived as a technical neologism.⁴ Since 1823 it has been applied in currying to denote "la partie de la peau qui va de la patte à la queue," and in 1868 the butcher's trade took it over to indicate "le milieu du gîte à la noix."

The English language borrowed both *nache* and *nage* some time after 1320; the spelling *aitch-bone*, used to denote the bone of the buttock or rump, reflects an aphaeresis which occurred in 1486. Another English borrowing is *nature*. The *NED* points out that it is pronounced *netchor* usually and *netiour* occasionally, and assigns to 1481 the first instance of the term *nature* applied to "the female pudendum (especially that of a mare)." Two centuries earlier *nature* had been used in French to indicate "les organes de la génération (surtout en parlant des femelles d'animaux)." Even today the natives of Gleize refer to "le vagin de la vache" as *natôre*, and, in the dialect of Bournois, *netiur* stands for "le pubis de la femelle." Thus it would be quite venial if one were to hesitate before deciding whether to derive *nate* from *natis* or from *natura*.

It is *nature* in an apocopated form which Albert Henry claims to see in *nate que nate*.⁵ His arguments, which embrace both phonetics and semantics, have won the approval of W. von Wartburg. Henry is on safe ground when he explains the Walloon *nate*, which means "vulve de la femme" in the mind of the urban population and "vulve de la vache" in the country, as a popular reduction in the nineteenth century of the decorous term *nature*.⁶ It is precisely Walloon *nate* which

¹ Godefroy quotes "*nates : nage*" in the Latin-French *Glossaire de Glasgow* composed in the middle of the thirteenth century and "*natica : naiche*" in the fifteenth-century *Glossaire de Montpellier*. M. Roques, *Bibl. Ecole hautes ét.*, Vol. 269 (1938), p. 270, has deciphered two scholia in a lexicon composed at the end of the fourteenth century: "7871 *nates : naches*; 7874 *natica*, idem quod *nates*, *naticula* le diminutivum : *naches*."

² The gloss nays "cuisses" was transcribed correctly as *najes* "fesses" in *Johns Hopkins Studies Rom. Lit. Lang.*, extra volume V (1932), 68.

³ Another of Godefroy's examples of *nages* is taken from paragraph 18 of *Les Livres du roy Modus et de la royne Ratio*. Tilander replaced it by *fesses* in his edition of 1932, but there is no justification for the emendation.

⁴ W. von Wartburg, *Frz. etym. Wtb.*, VII (Basel, 1953), 23a and 41a.

⁵ *Romania*, LXIX (1946), 174-84.

⁶ *Les Dialectes belgo-romans*, V (1946), 228-39.

Henry thinks is contained in the medieval proverb because "le sens figuré du vocable ancien se superpose fort bien à celui des patois modernes."

That leads us to trace the history of *nate* in Old French. Aside from the proverbial usage, it is found just once. In *Le Roman de Thèbes*, there is an interpolation *de pute nate*. Godefroy, V, 473c, suggests the definition "naissance, origine," but, in view of the pejorative context, it would be better to say "descendance, engeance." The crystallized formula enjoyed greater popularity in the Middle Ages. Henry gives four sources: *Le Dit des mesdisans*, 102; *Richars li biaux*, 4571; *Gerbert de Metz*, 802; No. 1324 in a collection of medieval proverbs.

In the first text, Mlle Bastin followed Godefroy in saying that *nate* means "origine, naissance,"⁷ but Långfors thought it referred to some "engin natté."⁸ In the case of *Richars li biaux*, Godefroy felt that the idea was that of other proverbs: "advienne que pourra, vaille que vaille." Tobler was inclined to detect a scribal error in *nate que nate*; so he went ahead and emended it to *naisse que naisse*, which he then interpreted as "werde daraus was will."⁹ In her edition of *Gerbert de Metz* (Namur, 1952), Miss Pauline Taylor reads the proverb as *nate que nate*, but she offers no commentary in the notes or in the glossary. Earlier Stengel had read *nace que nace*.¹⁰ This reading was accepted by Cohn, who treated *nace* as a regular derivative of *natio*, which blended with *nature* before being transformed into *nate*; the translation he proposed is "Art ist und bleibt doch Art."¹¹ Morawski prints proverb 1324 as "Nache que nache, ce dist li vilains," and he adds the variant "Nate que nate villain que villain."¹² He also lists proverb 1876 containing the form *nages*, and proverbs 1326, 1327, 1328, 1329, starting with the word *nature*. He never gives definitions, but one may construe *nache* as "fesse" and *nages* as "fesses"¹³ in contrast to *nature* used in the sense of "nature."

⁷ *Revue belge phil. hist.*, XX (1941), 479.

⁸ *Neuph. Mit.*, XLIII (1942), 40.

⁹ *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, XXXIII (1874), 1048.

¹⁰ *Rom. Studien*, I (1871), 480. Brother Camillus Casey, *Rom. Rev.*, XLVI (1955), 146, stresses the complexity of the proverb.

¹¹ Cohn, *Zts. frz. Spr. Lit.*, XLIII, No. 2 (1914), 19, assumed an ellipsis of the auxiliary in arriving at the interpretation: "nature est ce que nature peut être." Spitzer, *Romania*, LXX (1948), 74, would reverse the process: "Ne pourrait-on pas supposer une prononciation savante de *natio*, sans la palatalisation qui est à la base de *dedicatio* > *dédicace*? Le wallon *nate* 'nature de la femme et des animaux' serait, en effet, un autre reflet de ce *natio*, savant, ensuite vulgarisé."

¹² *Proverbes français antérieurs au quinzième siècle* (Paris, 1925), p. 114. Ulrich, *Zts. frz. Spr. Lit.*, XXIV, No. 1 (1902), 24, gave a better punctuation: no italics; comma between *nate* and *villain*.

¹³ It stands to reason that such a word would ordinarily be used in the plural; yet that detail was overlooked by Malkiel, *Language*, XXVIII (1952), 325, n. 127. In his opinion, *las nazgas* or *las nalgas* can be compared with *le derrière* in modern French. It would be more apposite to compare the Old Spanish forms with Old French *les naches* or even with modern French *les fesses*. Similar expressions are discussed in *MLN*, LV (1940), 532.

Henry feels that the popular mind could find no term emphasizing the subject more than the subject itself, hence the repetition. He treats the first word of the proverb as the predicate. As for the connecting *que*, he dismisses it as a relative particle, which is inherent in the proverb and which is devoid of any semantic value. When Mlle Bastin commented upon the expression, she was more circumspect in assigning to *que* the sense of "comme."

Henry insists upon separating etymologically Walloon *nate* from *nachale* used in the dialect of Virton to mean "vulve de la vache." Wartburg treats *nachale*, Ardennes *néchasse* "vulve de la vache" as well as Old French *nacherel*, denoting "une petite fesse" in *Le Roman de Renart*, as Gallo-Romance derivatives of the Vulgar Latin prototype **natica*; here, the diminutive would be **naticella*.

Under the circumstances, it is a moot problem whether to accept Henry's analysis as a valid explanation or as an ingenious hypothesis. One wonders whether the word-study which he presents is really that of the proverb in question. His conclusion can be challenged, because his extensive collection of modern vestiges of *nate* turns out to be a homonymic coincidence strictly limited to the Walloon zone. His readiness to dismiss the Old French orthography as inaccurate and then to alter it so as to make it fit into the desired pattern is tantamount to paleographic license. One forms that impression when Henry treats the manuscript used by Ulrich and Morawski as faulty and when he brands Stengel's *nace que nace* as a misreading. As indicated above, Cohn, who went from *nace* to *nate*, and Spitzer, who goes from *nate* to *nace*, view both forms as legitimate. Furthermore *nages* in proverb 1876 is a synonym. Classical Latin *natis* can serve as the point of departure for *nate*, but recourse must be had to Vulgar Latin **natica* in order to account for *nache*, *nace*, *nage*.

The interpretation is figurative, not only for the medieval proverb but also for related terms. Godefroy, V, 462a, lists *Nacheus*, *Nachu*, *Naschu* as a proper name in archives dated 1329, 1420, 1429; as a common noun, the literal meaning would be "qui a de grosses fesses, fessu."¹⁴ According to Wartburg, the people who dwell in the Vallée d'Aoste call a "laide figure" a *natsa*. Mistral, II, 397a, records *nato* "figure, face" in modern Provençal.

The proverbial expression is clearly characteristic of impolite style, regardless of the spelling of the noun. The literal meaning "fesse" is transferred in French by metonymy as easily as its English counterpart is used by uncouth speakers in an obscene atmosphere. H. J. Green once devoted an article to *Gerbert de Metz*, which shows that discourteous language is fully appropriate in the context: Fromont,

¹⁴ This adjective *nacheus* has nothing to do with popular words meaning "méticuleux a l'excès pour la nourriture": *nactieus* in the 1650 dictionary of Ménage, II, 237; Lorrain *nakiad* in Zéligzon, *Dict. patois romans Moselle* (Strasbourg, 1924), p. 467; Rouchi *nacsieüs*. Haust, *Romanica Helvetica*, XX (1943), 390, 395, derives *nacsieüs* from the old verb *naschier* < *nascicare*, and he lists Walloon *nachale* "vulve de la vache" but without commentary.

of disgraceful lineage, runs away to Spain, where he acts as did Ganelon; Fromont abjures Christianity and boasts that he can make Marsile master over all France very easily; the traitor marches up to Bordeaux at the head of a large army of Saracens, but the pagans are shoved back beyond the Pyrenees; finally, Marsile seizes Fromont and slays him.¹⁵

Henry noticed the relationship between proverb 1324, "Nache que nache, ce dist li vilains," and proverbs 2484 and 2200: "Villain que villain," "Ribaut que ribaut." When he offered the interpretation, "Chacun agit suivant sa nature," he was not guided by the pejorative force of the variant: "Nate que nate, villain que villain." Here the precise significance of the indecorous expression is revealed by an apposition, which equated *nache* or *nate* deliberately with the personal epithets *villain* and *ribaut*, and which used *que* thrice in the same way. That point is fundamental in attempting to fathom the terseness of these three proverbs. Each of the pithy expressions has the same connotation: "Once a cad, always a cad." If you are dealing with a person of that ilk, do not expect anything decent from him.

University of Texas

¹⁵ H. J. Green, *MLN*, LVI (1941), 335.

THE MEDIEVAL FRENCH LIVES OF SAINT FIACRE

By M. E. PORTER and J. H. BALTZELL

The medieval French legend of Saint Fiacre, patron of Brie, protector of gardeners, curer of hemorrhoids, is presented in ten works of the fifteenth century and in one of the early sixteenth. Since only one of these¹ has been published in modern times, this paper is intended to call attention to them and to the legend on which they are based.

Nothing is known about the historical Fiacre beyond the fact that he came from Ireland to settle as a hermit at Breuil (now Saint-Fiacre) near Meaux during the time of Burgundofaro, dying there about 670.² Legend has supplied the additional details found in the works analyzed below and in the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum*, VI Aug., 598 ff.

The earliest literary references to Fiacre occur in the works of Hildegarius of Meaux (ninth century) and of Fulcoius of Beauvais (eleventh century).³ The first work devoted entirely to him seems to be that in a thirteenth-century Latin manuscript of Dijon,⁴ followed

¹ The Ste Geneviève play, in a very faulty transcription by Achille Jubinal in *Mystères inédits du quinzième siècle* (Paris, 1837), I, 304-53, and in a not much better one by Edouard Fournier in *Théâtre français avant la Renaissance* (Paris, n.d.), pp. 19-35.

² The saint's original name seems to have been Fefrus, changed after his death to Fiacre. See Collin de Plancy, *Dictionnaire critique des reliques et des images miraculeuses* (Paris, 1821), I, 312; Mas Latrie, *Trésor de chronologie d'histoire et de géographie* (Paris, 1889), p. 730. Smith and Wace (*Dictionary of Christian Biography* [London, 1880], II, 509) give a derivation of Fiacre from Gaelic *fiach* "value." It seems more likely, however, that the name of the saint is to be connected with French *fic* from Latin *ficus* "fig-shaped excrescence of flesh," with the cure of which, particularly in the form of hemorrhoids, he has been associated. See Erik v. Kraemer, *Les Maladies désignées par le nom d'un saint*, Societas Scientiarum Fennicae (Copenhagen/Helsingfors, 1950), pp. 20 ff. Regarding Fiacre's stone, see below, note 18. Toussaints DuPlessis (*Histoire de l'église de Meaux* [Paris, 1731], I, 862), depending on chroniclers steeped in legend, reports that Fiacre came to France in 626. On the emigration of numerous Irish monks to the continent in the seventh century, see Louis J. Paetow, *Guide to the Study of Medieval History* (New York, 1931), pp. 162-63. On Faro, see Joseph Bédier, *Légendes épiques* (Paris, 1913), IV, 289-335; *Les Grandes chroniques de France*, ed. Jules Viard, Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris, 1901-06), II, 105 ff.; Auguste Molinier, *Sources de l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1901-06), I, 138; Dom L. H. Cottineau, *Répertoire topobibliographique des abbayes et prieurés* (Mâcon, 1939), II, cols. 1538-39.

³ Hildegarius' *Vita Faronis* was published by Dom Jean Mabillon in *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti* (Paris, 1669), II, 606-25; by Bruno Krusch in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* (Hanover and Leipzig, 1910), V, 171-203; and by the Bollandists, *Acta SS*, XII Oct., pp. 593-623. On Fulcoius, see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, VIII (1747), 113-20; J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1880), CL, cols. 1551-58; *Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (Paris, 1856), XVII, 294-95.

⁴ Published in *Acta SS*, VI Aug., p. 616. On the dating, see V. Daunou, *HLF*, XIV, 633, and LeClercq, *ibid.*, XXI, 578. The other Latin works are listed by Thomas D. Hardy, *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials Relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, Rolls Series (London, 1862), I, Pt. 1, 272-74. Since no one of them is identifiable as a direct source for the French lives, they are not discussed here.

by four later Latin works. While there are in French such brief references to him as that in Chrétien's *Lancelot* and in the *Vilains* (thirteenth century),⁵ no extensive treatment was accorded him before the fifteenth century, when he seems to have captured much attention.⁶

Strangely enough, the Fiacre cult appears to have reached its high point in the seventeenth century,⁷ when a rented carriage⁸ and two streets in Paris⁹ were named for him. Marie de Médicis contributed to the restoration of the sanctuary at Breuil,¹⁰ and Richelieu, in 1637, had a vertebra of the saint brought to Paris hoping for alleviation of

⁵ *Lancelot*, ed. Wendelin Foerster (Halle, 1899), 54; *Des Vilains*, ed. Edmond Faral, R, XLVIII (1932), 259, 264.

⁶ Jean de Roye (*Journal*, pub. Bernard de Mandrot, Société de l'Histoire de France [Paris, 1896], II, 76) reports that Louis XI spent seven silver marks to have a Fiacre reliquary embellished. See also *Gallia Christiana*, VIII, col. 1700. Enguerran de Monstrelet (*Chronique*, ed. L. Douët-d'Arco, Société de l'Histoire de France [Paris, 1858], I, 238) speaks of the pilgrimage to Saint-Fiacre as a common thing. In the sixteenth century, Rabelais uses Fiacre as a good basis for an oath. See *Œuvres*, ed. Abel Lefranc (Paris, 1912), I, 159 and III, 137; Livre III, ch. clvii; Livre I, ch. xvii. See also *Revue des Études Rabelaisiennes*, IV (1906), 208; Lazare Sainéan, *La Langue de Rabelais* (Paris, 1923), II, 358; Walter Gottschalk, "Die Heiligen in den sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der französischen Sprache," *Behrens-Festschrift* (Jena and Leipzig, 1929), p. 141.

⁷ This popularity may be due at least in part to the fame of a certain Frère Fiacre. See note 12 below. Ansart de Taupon (*Histoire de Saint Fiacre et de son monastère* [Paris, 1784], pp. 236, 257, and elsewhere) lists many notables of the seventeenth century who were benefactors of the priory. DuPlessis, I, 57 f., enumerates miraculous cures alleged to have occurred at Saint-Fiacre during the first half of the century.

⁸ The usual explanation for *fiacre* "hired coach" goes back to Gilles Ménage (*Les Origines de la langue françoise* [Paris, 1650], p. 315), who gives the following: "On appelle ainsi à Paris depuis quelques années un carrosse de loüage, acause de l'image Saint Fiacre qui pend pour enseigne d'un logis de la ruë saint Antoine, où on louë des carrosses." Antoine Furetière (*Dictionnaire Universelle* [The Hague, 1727], under *fiacre*), the *Dictionnaire de Trevoux* (Nancy, 1734), II, col. 1780, Walter von Wartburg (both in *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* under *fiacre* and in *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue française* [Paris, 1950], p. 249), and others who give the Ménage etymology seem to be in error when they refer to him as an eyewitness, for he makes no such claim. There was disagreement among the early etymologists as to the street in which the *fiacres* were first rented, some saying that it was rue St. Martin. Edouard Fournier (*Enigmes des rues de Paris* [1892], pp. 59-75) has investigated the question and has reached the conclusion that the vehicle was named rather for the man who first rented them. DuPlessis, II, 683, claims that they were so called because they were first used to convey Parisians on pilgrimage to Saint-Fiacre. Jacques Dulaure (*Histoire physique, civile et morale de Paris* [1823], V, 367) holds that they bore the name of the Frère Fiacre mentioned below in note 12. Others (Smith and Wace, *loc. cit.*) say that the carriage bore an image of our saint. The question is perhaps not capable of solution.

⁹ See Marquis de Rochegude et al., *Guide pratique à travers le vieux Paris* (Paris, n.d.), pp. 51, 208; Emile Roy, *Études sur le théâtre français* (Paris, 1902), p. cciv; Edouard Fournier, *Enigmes*, p. 55; *Paris ridicule et burlesque*, ed. Paul Lacroix (Paris, 1859), p. 351.

¹⁰ See dedication of Michel Pirou's *La Vie admirable de S. Fiacre* (Paris, 1625) which indicates that Marie contributed funds for rebuilding the monastery and also laid the cornerstone of it. See also Louis Batiffol (*Vie intime d'une reine de France* [Paris, 1906], pp. 66-67), who reports that Marie sent Fiacre relics to her aunt, the Grand Duchess of Tuscany.

painful ailments.¹¹ Anne d'Autriche is reported to have implored the saint's aid during an illness of Louis XIII, and also to have attributed to his benevolent intercession the birth of Louis XIV after her childless marriage of twenty-two years.¹² Bossuet included a lesson on Fiacre in the catechism which he composed for his diocese, and he prayed at the saint's shrine for the recovery of Louis XIV from a fistula operation.¹³ Book-length accounts of the saint's life were published as late as 1878 when Jules Schuster's *Vie abrégée de Saint Fiacre* appeared in Paris.

The medieval French accounts of Saint Fiacre fall, by reason of their content, into four versions.¹⁴ The first includes a poem in octosyllables rhyming *a b a b b c b* preserved in Gothic editions by Denis Meslier and Jehan Trepperel,¹⁵ and in prose adaptations in MSS *fonds français* 2435 (folios 192^{vo}-206^{vo}) and 2463 (folios 187^{vo}-203) of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The account presented by these four works, all of the fifteenth century, is identical. The slight variations between the poems may point to an earlier poem as the source for both, while the close similarity in phraseology between the prose works and the poems indicates that the former were derived from the latter. The Trepperel version (927 lines), which includes a page of 58 lines missing in Meslier and is somewhat more correct in details of language, is used for the analysis which follows.

¹¹ A scurrilous poem, "Sur l'enlèvement des reliques de saint Fiacre, apportées de la ville de Meaux pour la guérison du derrière du C. de R.," was circulated with reference to the matter. It is reprinted in Edouard Fournier's *Variétés historiques et littéraires* (Paris, 1857), VII, 231-36; and also in the *Bibliothèque facétieuse historique et singulière* (Paris, 1858), pp. 1 ff. The relics were moved to Meaux in 1658 at the time of the wars with the Calvinists. See *Gall. Chr.*, loc. cit.; DuPlessis, I, 684. Later the cathedral refused to return them, and a quarrel ensued. In 1683, Louis XIV was petitioned at the time he made a stop at Saint-Fiacre, but Bossuet persuaded him that the relics should remain in the safekeeping of the cathedral.

¹² For Anne's pilgrimages to Saint-Fiacre, see DuPlessis, I, 58, and Ansart, p. 269. According to Martha W. Freer (*Married Life of Anne of Austria* [New York, 1913], pp. 424 f.), on November 3, 1637, one Frère Fiacre, an Augustinian monk of Paris, announced to Anne that in a vision the Virgin had predicted to him the birth of a Dauphin. In any case, Ansart (p. 245) and DuPlessis (I, 59) report that Anne presented to the priory the *langes bénis* which Pope Urban VIII sent her for the birth of Louis XIV. With reference to Frère Fiacre, it should be noted that Quérard (*Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes* [Paris, 1879], I, col. 977) lists *La Vie du vénérable frère Fiacre (Denis Anthaume), Augustin Déchaussé* (Par le P. Gabriel de Sainte Claire), Paris, 1722, in-12. See also Dulaure, V, 367 f.

¹³ For the catechism, see *Œuvres complètes de Bossuet*, ed. F. Lachat (Paris, 1875), V, 199-200. On the fistula, see Ansart, p. 283, and DuPlessis, I, 59. The power of the saint must have been working; Louis recovered.

¹⁴ Léopold Delisle (*Cabinet des manuscrits* [Paris, 1868-81], III, 157, No. 929) lists a version apparently now lost.

¹⁵ On Trepperel, see Eugénie Droz, *Le Recueil Trepperel* (Paris, 1935), pp. xxxii f.; Robert Brun, *Le Livre français* (Paris, 1948), p. 38; Hugh W. Davies, *Devices of the Early Printers* (London, 1935), p. 268, where his working period is said to be 1491(?) to 1501(?). The copy used for the present study is in the British Museum. On Meslier (Mellier), see André Blum, *Origins of Printing and Engraving*, trans. Harry M. Lydenberg (New York, 1940), p. 182, who dates works printed by him 1490-92. The Meslier copy used for this study is Res Ye 819 of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

After a general exhortation to study and to emulate the saints, the young Fiacre is presented, well-reared, devoted to chastity, refusing to participate in worldly pleasures as his father, Count of Imbernie, urges him to do, or to marry the noble and beautiful girl chosen for him. Renouncing his heritage,¹⁶ he flees overseas to Meaux, where he is graciously received by Bishop Faro. After a period as the latter's secretary, Fiacre requests and is granted a plot of wasteland some two leagues away at Breuil. There he constructs with his own hands a chapel and a dwelling, wears the hairshirt, and lives on a minimum of bread and water. During this time, the father and the prospective bride search in vain for the vanished youth. Fiacre's fame as a thaumaturge spreads. Upon further request, Faro grants him such land as he can cultivate in one day, a plot which proves to be vast since trees fall and the soil turns itself at the mere approach of his spade.

A woman¹⁷ accuses Fiacre of exercising magic. The saint sits upon a stone which becomes soft as long as he is on it,¹⁸ proving that he is a holy man and that the accusation is false. Fiacre prays that no woman ever be permitted to enter his church. Another woman, wishing to test the power of the saint, pushes her maid into the chapel and immediately becomes blind in one eye.

Fiacre's would-be spouse, with the help of an unnamed man, reaches the hermitage in her search. Fiacre prays to be rendered unrecognizable, and is suddenly so covered with *fics* that the girl indeed does not know him. He advises her to expect nothing from him and to maintain her virginity. She sorrowfully returns home with the sad news.

After a chaste life spent in curing diverse illnesses, Fiacre sickens and dies with all the angels of heaven in attendance to carry his soul to Paradise. He is canonized by Faro, and a shrine is erected over his remains. Several miracles take place, including that of an unspecified English king¹⁹ who, desiring to return the saint's body to its

¹⁶ The French legends uniformly present Fiacre as an only son. The Latin legends, on the other hand, hold that he was the younger son of Eugenius IV, King of Scotland. When his brother, the tyrant Ferquard, was deposed, Fiacre refused the crown which a deputation from Scotland came to Meaux to offer him. See *Acta SS*, VI Aug., p. 603. Fiacre's renunciation is sometimes represented in art by a crown at his feet. See Ch. Cahier, *Caractéristiques des saints dans l'art populaire* (Paris, 1867), I, 267. For other representations of Fiacre in art, see S. Baring-Gould, *Lives of the Saints* (Edinburgh, 1914), IX, 385-86; Joseph Braun, *Trach und Attribute der Heiligen in der deutschen Kunst* (Stuttgart, 1943), p. 258. There is a statue of him at the Cloisters in New York.

¹⁷ Usually referred to in Latin legend as Becnaude. None of the French works names her except the Ste Geneviève play, which calls her Hondée. For a pictorial representation of Becnaude making her accusation before Faro, see Cahier, I, 408.

¹⁸ According to Collin de Plancy (I, 314), the stone was still in the chapel at Saint-Fiacre at the end of the eighteenth century. DuPlessis (I, 55) tells us that it was conveniently located at the left of the entrance and so arranged that sufferers from hemorrhoids could sit on it "avec modestie sans se devoir ni relever leurs habits." It often appears in iconography of the saint. See Cahier, I, 382.

native land, is unable to get it beyond the borders of its own territory despite the efforts of forty horses. The king returns to Meaux, is smitten with the *mal de Fiacre*, and dies.

The second version of the Fiacre story in medieval French is the Vignay translation of Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*, which is preserved in MSS *fonds français* 184 (folios 402^{vo}-405), 242 (folios 313-17), 243 (folios 392^{vo}-95), 416 (folios 253^{vo}-57) of the Bibliothèque Nationale, and 452 (folios 276^{vo}-80) of the Bibliothèque Municipale at Lille. It is much shorter than the first version and differs in minor detail, following the Latin legends somewhat more closely.²⁰

Though there is no mention of marriage, Fiacre renounces his heritage, flees to Faro, and settles as a hermit at Bordille, where he builds his church and hospice. He is visited by Chillenus, a cousin not mentioned in the other French accounts. Then, briefly related, are the same events as in the first version, with the addition of the miracle of a woman whose foot becomes painfully swollen when she puts it into the chapel.

The third version of the Fiacre story is a play contained (folios 55^{vo}-69^{vo}) in the famous MS 1131 of the Bibliothèque Sainte Geneviève.²¹ It is of exceptional interest both as an example of the material performed by the early *confréries* in Paris, and because it contains, inserted into the life of the saint, the earliest surviving example of a conventional French farce²² so designated by the copyist. Since adequate analyses are readily available,²³ no further discussion is necessary here.

¹⁹ Ansart, p. 68, repeats legends that John Lackland met death as retribution for an unsuccessful attempt to carry away the saint's chin, and that Henry V, having caught the fish in the priory pool and fed them to his suite, was killed by the saint. There is no evidence that John, who died in England, ever showed an interest in Fiacre. See Kate Norgate, *John Lackland* (London, 1902), p. 281; Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII* (Paris, 1894), p. 110. Henry V, on the other hand, indeed died of dysentery at Vincennes on August 3, 1422, a few months after capturing Meaux and the surrounding region from the Armagnacs. See Ernest Lavisse, *Histoire de France* (Paris, 1902), IV, Pt. 1, 289; Jean Juvenal des Ursins, *Histoire de Charles VI*, ed. Joseph Michaud et al., in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la France* (Paris, 1836), II, 567.

²⁰ The Fiacre sketch in Caxton's version of the *Golden Legend* is an almost literal translation of this account. See *Golden Legend or Lives of the Saints as Englished by William Caxton*, ed. F. S. Ellis, Temple Classics (London, 1931), VII, 173-80; William Blades, *Biography and Typography of William Caxton* (New York, 1882), pp. 283, 310, 365.

²¹ The manuscript is described by Ch. Kohler in *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque Ste Geneviève* (Paris, 1893-96), I, 511-15. For editions of the play, see note 1 above. See also: Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères* (Paris, 1880), II, 511-12; Gustav Groeber, *Geschichte der Mittelfranzösischen Literatur*, 2nd ed. by Stefan Hofer (Berlin/Leipzig, 1932), p. 213.

²² See Howard G. Harvey, *Theatre of the Basoche* (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), p. 111; Petit de Julleville, *Répertoire du théâtre comique en France au moyen âge* (Paris, 1886), pp. 116-17.

²³ For example, in Grace Frank, *Medieval French Drama* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 139-41. For another summary, see the Duc de la Vallière, *Bibliothèque du théâtre français* (Dresden, 1768), I, 37-38.

The fourth version of the Fiacre story in medieval French is a play in octosyllabic couplets, with fifteen characters, preserved in a Gothic edition printed in Paris for Jehan Saint Denis during the first third of the sixteenth century.²⁴ According to Brunet,²⁵ copies of the play are very rare. The one used for this study is Res Yf 1605 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The writer's striving for a sophisticated style results in bombast and turgidity worthy of the worst efforts of the Grands Rhétoriciens. There is none of the freshness and spontaneity of the Sainte Geneviève play.

Fiacre's parents, deciding that the boy must take a wife, summon him. Satan, always in the background during the action, calls upon his devils to rejoice, for Fiacre will soon be theirs. Fiacre is informed that he must, in the interests of the dynasty, assume the duties of his rank and live like a noble. He refuses, and an argument ensues. Satan is disturbed; he must find a new method of attack. The parents decide to have the *maître d'hostel* and the *maître d'escole* try to persuade Fiacre, who now prays for divine aid. *Force de Courage* appears and offers guidance. Satan declares that he is going to have to work hard.

The two *maîtres* put forth to Fiacre their most powerful arguments: first, the physical delights of wedded life, and second, patriotic duty. Since nobility is divinely established, they say, and since nobles are created for the defense of the common people, heaven can be won as readily by performance of royal duties as by devotion to religion. Fiacre replies only that military people are "pillars sans justice" and that he will never be one of them.

The *maître d'hostel* suggests the daughter of the Admiral of Scotland. Perhaps on seeing her beauty, Fiacre will change his mind. The parents dispatch the two *maîtres* with rich gifts to ask for the hand of the noble girl. Fiacre prays, and *Force de Courage* advises flight.

The *maîtres* and the Admiral exchange flamboyant greetings. Everyone, including the daughter, is pleased. She is handed over to the envoys with the warning that she will need all her wiles since Fiacre is "ung petit estrange." With her mother and the *maîtres*, she sets out for the Count's palace, confident of success. Satan summons his devils to rejoice, for Fiacre now seems within his grasp.

The Countess, busy with preparations, learns that Fiacre is, as usual, in solitary meditation. The guests arrive, and flowery greetings are exchanged. Jehanne, the maid, is sent to call Fiacre, who is found on his knees at prayer, sensing that "aulcun meschef" is afoot. A leper passes and realistically describes his sufferings. Fiacre is

²⁴ See Ph. Renouard, *Les Marques typographiques parisiennes des XV^e et XVI^e siècles* (Paris, 1938), p. 330; Hugh W. Davies, p. 332; Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, II, 513 f.; Johann Graesse, *Trésor de livres rares* (Milan, n.d.), VI, 221; Groeber, p. 211. Frank (p. 201) notes that Fiacre appears in a later play, but does not give any information about it.

²⁵ *Manuel* (Paris, 1864), col. 1191.

introduced to the girl and is informed by the Count that refusal to marry her will not be tolerated. Fiacre begs that decision be deferred until the following day, at which time he will do as desired.

Fiacre admires the girl's beauty as she does his. Longing for a kiss, and about to weaken in his purpose, he prays for divine aid. *Force de Courage* urges immediate departure. The leper again appears, begging alms. Fiacre, kissing him and exchanging clothes with him, is then led by *Force de Courage* to *Port de Tranquillité*. *Doubter de Mesprendre*, the sailor, takes him aboard *Bien Perseverer*, his ship, and *Vigoureuse Foy*, the helm, prepares to function.

We return to the Count and the others who are desolated at Fiacre's disappearance. While the girl calls upon death, the squire is sent to search, and Satan, fearing he will lose Fiacre, calls upon all his minions. Meanwhile, the sail, *Singularité de Grace*, has carried the ship and Fiacre to France. The play ends here with a prayer by Fiacre that all men may be given *Bien Perseverer* so that they also may reach Paradise.

Such are the surviving medieval French treatments of the legend of Saint Fiacre whose fame did not begin to spread for several centuries after his death. One may say with Joseph Bédier²⁶ that the monks in Meaux and vicinity seized upon him when the *chansons de geste* concerning Ogier le Danois, whose tomb they had long displayed, were no longer fashionable. Then they called upon the saint to perform for them the services which they had received from the celebrated knight.

Indiana University
College of William and Mary

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, II, 310.

BAUDELAIRE AND HIS FRENCH CRITICS, 1868-1881

By ROBERT NUGENT

Ernst-Robert Curtius, in his *Essai sur la France*, points out (p. 194) that Baudelaire introduced modernism into the heart of French literature and that his perception of different values in poetry demanded a new kind of reader, one who must have already formed tastes enabling him to accept the changes in poetic tone and aesthetic outlook evident in the *Fleurs du mal*. The present-day reader finds in Baudelaire the prototype of the modern poet as a man faced with the difficulty of solving the dilemma of his own weaknesses and shortcomings (with the perplexity involved in a struggle between a certain metaphysical or religious or even psychological approach toward himself) and as a writer confronted with the problems of poetry as such. The frankness of self-awareness which makes Baudelaire the poet of our time appeared indecent to "official" critics of his day, unaware as they seemed to be of the spiritual drama taking place in the poems. The result is a moralistic criticism unable to understand the essential dignity of the *Fleurs*. It has as a focus point the cliché of Baudelairean decadence to which Gautier's *Préface* to the 1868 edition of the poems gave definite form. Moreover, a great deal of Baudelaire's way of feeling proceeded from contacts made with other writers and artists in the forties; his reputation as a Satanic poet grew, and the question of his originality remained an awkward one for his contemporaries. After the poet's death in 1867, they published volumes and articles, mainly of reminiscence and anecdote, which tended toward an informal biography. None, however, posed the modernity of Baudelaire until Bourget's essay in 1881 acknowledged the poet as worthy of serious study.

In the seventies Baudelaire appeared a decadent poet to most *connaisseurs* of poetry. Pontmartin's remarks are undoubtedly typical, written as they are by a critic who held an "official" position on a journal of wide circulation. While still writing for the *Gazette de France*, he published in 1868, in the seventh series of the *Nouveaux samedis*, an article dated 1866 in which he discussed Baudelaire as a poet of close association with the world of painting: Fernand Brissard (in whose salon he met Gautier), Deroy, Chenevard, Préault, the youthful enthusiasm for Delacroix. In his imaginative wrath, his pen trembling with indignation, Pontmartin described for his readers a studio where religion was of the flesh, where a group of artists and courtisans, "frottés de musc, gorgés d'haschisch," took up the attitudes of the charnel house and the *lupanar*.¹ Subject matter, flaunting

¹ Armand de Pontmartin, *Nouveaux samedis*, VII (Lévy, 1868), 41. Earlier Pontmartin had admired Baudelaire as a translator of the *Histoires extraordinaires* but had rejected him for moral principles, while recognizing his *fantaisie* as a literary affectation and not a personal one. See W. T. Bandy, *Baudelaire Judged by His Contemporaries* (New York, 1933), article entries 24, 99, 126, and 244.

of immorality, and unconventional use of imagery are the points of attack, as was usual in comments upon Baudelaire's verse. Pontmartin did not grasp the significance of the *correspondances*, for he believed that the principal defects of the poems were in the choice of metaphors and qualified the poetry as "macabre, cadavérique, démoniaque et vampirique."

Pontmartin, like many readers who sincerely tried to find poetic worth in the *Fleurs*, found it impossible to understand the role aesthetics played in the resolution of difficulties between subject matter (often typical choices of the earlier Bouzingsots, for example, which Baudelaire inherited) and the novelty of the artistic handling of the themes. The preoccupation with morality—so clearly seen at a time when Renouvier, taking up Kant and the validity of personal experience, called for a renewed morality in *La Science de la morale* (1869) and Renan published his *La Réforme intellectuelle et morale* (1871)—was more a problem with Pontmartin than aesthetics. His misunderstanding of the artistic integrity of the *Fleurs* could be read in the light of the inaccessibility of the poems to an admirer of more accessible verse, Romantic or Parnassian, or even Classical (Pontmartin is said to have enjoyed Virgil throughout his life). The problems involved in aesthetic inaccessibility are visible in Mallarmé (almost unknown at this time), who conceived of the reader as one whom the poet initiates into the mysteries of vocabulary and themes. (The *Hérodiade* was printed in the second *Parnasse contemporain* in 1871.) The idea of moral inaccessibility is apparent in the little attention given to Baudelaire as a poet who frequently found himself in a moral quandary, let alone as a Catholic poet concerned with original sin, which Eliot in the twentieth century will argue as witness to Baudelaire's greatness.²

The cliché of Baudelairean decadence—the favorite one from which a reader could view Baudelaire and be thoroughly shocked—was summed up in Gautier's *Préface* for the 1868 edition of the poems. (It was reprinted in the *Portraits et souvenirs littéraires* in 1875.) Gautier, though he did not have the official critical function of either Pontmartin or Sainte-Beuve, came to be recognized, through the successive editions of the *Émaux et camées* and his doctrine of art for art's sake, as an authority on matters of poetry. The concept he

² The question of Sainte-Beuve's indifference to Baudelaire's poetry and his frequently quoted remark, "la pointe extrême du Kamchatka romantique," has been discussed at length by Vandérem. The author of the *Lundis*, had he been less preoccupied with politics in the last years of his life, might have had his attention drawn to Baudelaire's achievement by the third edition of the poems in 1868. His personal sympathy at the time of the trial and the Academy scandal are apparent in the two-volume *Correspondances* of 1877 and in the one volume *Nouvelle correspondance* of 1880. Schérer, who took up the critical mantle laid aside by Sainte-Beuve, condemned Baudelaire on all grounds—moral, aesthetic, personal—in his *Études sur la littérature contemporaine*, IV, 1st ed. (Calmann-Lévy, 1874), Ch. XX, pp. 281-91, perhaps a leftover from his Protestant theological past.

formed of Baudelaire's significance was important, for his name was associated with Baudelaire's in the latter's dedication of the *Fleurs* to the older poet and in their mutual friendships in artistic and literary circles. A brief glance at Gautier's other contributions to Baudelaire criticism is necessary to gain a perspective for the content of the *Préface*.

Gautier had written a *Notice sur Baudelaire* for Crépet's anthology of French poetry, *Les Poètes français* (Hachette, 1862). This introduction is, for the most part, reproduced in the *Histoire du romantisme* (1874), covering the years 1830 to 1868, which Gautier was working on during the same year he wrote the *Préface*.³ To this original *Notice* Gautier made additions which had to do with Baudelaire's contributions to the first *Parnasse* (1866). As Kenneth Cornell has pointed out, Gautier's reservations concern the morbidity and the eccentricity of the *Fleurs*; that Gautier was "enough of a hater of banality to appreciate Baudelaire's originality, but he did not embrace the elements which the symbolists were to make their own, the complicated music, the suggestion, the interrelationships of the senses."⁴ The defender of art for art's sake, in his article for *Le Moniteur universel* for September 9, 1867, had little to say concerning Baudelaire's poetry. A poorly organized discussion of Baudelaire's translations, it compared Baudelaire and Hawthorne, with special reference to *Rappaccini's Daughter*. This article, with the omission of the details of Baudelaire's death, was published in book form in the *Portraits contemporains*, by Charpentier in 1872, and presented a picture of Baudelaire's work unmodified by the years.⁵

The emphasis on the morbid or macabre quality of the *Fleurs* seen in these commentaries was brought out and expanded, in Gautier's *Préface*, into the cliché of Baudelairean decadence—*dandysme*, *artificiel*, *morbidité*—which was the canon of Baudelaire criticism for years to come.⁶ The *Préface* left aside the great importance of the perception in Baudelaire of his inner conflict between moral values and his own failures and incapacities. For the poet of the *Émaux et camées*, Baudelaire was the cultivator of paradox (not caricature, which, though much admired in the Hôtel de Pimodan, never attracted Baudelaire); his interests lay in finding contrasts in his surroundings, excesses in the actions of those about him. Gautier stressed the cult of the Black Venus, which, it seemed to him, derived from Baudelaire's exoticism, due, he supposed, to the trip to India. He insisted upon the poet's need to be original, which in Baudelaire lay in "wickedness" (*perversité*), not personal but thematic; in the choice of horrid or distasteful subjects which were apart from the range of Romantic writing; in his satanism.

³ Bandy, book entry 28.

⁴ Kenneth Cornell, *The Symbolist Movement* (New Haven, 1951), p. 6.

⁵ Bandy, article entry 238.

⁶ Théophile Gautier, "Préface aux *Fleurs du mal*," in Charles Baudelaire, *Œuvres complètes*, I: *Les Fleurs du mal* (Calmann-Lévy, 1868), pp. 1-75.

Gautier was somewhat perplexed as to where Baudelaire's originality tended.⁷ He admired the *Fleurs* as Parnassian and appreciated the novelty of the subject matter as a part of the great tradition of *épater le bourgeois*. In critical retrospect the *Préface* had value in situating Baudelaire as a Romantic or a Parnassian (which present-day commentators neglect when they see him only in the light of twentieth-century poetic accomplishments), or in showing the influence of *La Jeune France*. This position was further emphasized by the publication of the *Tombeau* for Théophile Gautier in 1873, the year following his death. Here Gautier was addressed as *maître* in Mallarmé's *Toast funèbre* and was praised for the excellence of his sculptured verse, his choice of precise and concrete images. Baudelaire, who used the poetic forms available in the forties and fifties, was seen to have, in the shade cast by his contemporaries, the position of a disciple who followed Parnassian descriptive goals and whose contribution was the bizarre and decadent subject.

To correct the impression given by Pontmartin or to escape the restrictions imposed by the comments of Gautier, a careful biography would have modified the limitations of Baudelaire as a decadent or morbid writer and would have found the critic going beyond anecdote to make a more precise estimate of Baudelaire's achievements. It is not that sympathy was lacking. Asselineau, always the poet's devoted friend, the one who perhaps knew Baudelaire better than did any one else, published a study-biography of his friend in 1869; as he had at the poet's burial, he protested against the slight notice paid Baudelaire and against the notoriety of the legend of his decadence.⁸ Noël,⁹ who knew Baudelaire only in his last illness; Banville, like Asselineau, a close friend of the poet;¹⁰ Cladel, who considered himself Baudelaire's pupil;¹¹ and Laujol, an active participant in

⁷ Gautier's position is similar to that of critics who, despite the reputation of curious legends which cling to Baudelaire's name after his death, still are aware of his poetic originality. Cf. the article by G. Maillard, "Hier-Aujourd'hui-Demain," *Figaro*, Sept. 2, 1867. Reproduced in Bandy, article entry 196.

⁸ Charles Asselineau, *Charles Baudelaire: Sa vie et son œuvre* (Lemerre, 1869). The funeral *discours* is reproduced in the Pincebourde collection of 1872. Cf. Bandy, article entry 199.

⁹ G. Noël, "Les Poètes nouveaux: Charles Baudelaire," *Revue contemporaine*, July-August, 1869, pp. 502-21. It was the critic's opinion that Baudelaire's verse had newness and sensitiveness, to which was joined a great analytical subtlety, especially evident in the poet's ability to describe both ideas and feelings. And although Baudelaire lacked the scope which would have made him the equal of the greatest poets (Noël was undoubtedly thinking of Hugo and Vigny), he was nevertheless a writer to be esteemed and read.

¹⁰ Banville's article appeared in the first number (April 27, 1872) of the *Renaissance artistique et littéraire* and consisted mainly of a description of Baudelaire's living quarters; Banville showed sympathy and friendship which kept his friend's name alive. The only other mention of Baudelaire in this magazine (according to Cornéli, pp. 17-18) was the bibliographical note concerning Cousin and Spoelberch's *Charles Baudelaire*.

¹¹ Cladel's article appeared in the September, 1876, issue of the *Musée des deux mondes*. It did not contribute very much to Baudelaire's reputation except

literary circles in the early sixties—all wrote in this reminiscent vein about the author of the *Fleurs*.

It was in the series of letters which Henry Laujol wrote for *La République des Lettres* (December 20 and 27, 1875, and January 4, 1876) that this critic made worthwhile contributions toward ascertaining Baudelaire's place among his contemporaries and also favorable additions to Baudelaire's reputation as a poet. The first of this series, entitled "Comment le poète Albert Glatigny s'en vint à la conquête de la ville de Paris," described the literary atmosphere prevailing at the beginning of the year 1861.¹² Laujol remarked that there were then four poets of greatest prestige: Gautier, Baudelaire, Leconte de Lisle, and Banville. Victor Hugo, though he held a dominant position in French letters, could not take part in the literary life of the capital, being in exile in Jersey. Gautier reigned; Leconte de Lisle, appreciated by members of Parnassian poetic groups, did not have a large popular appeal. Baudelaire, according to Laujol, already enchanted the *connaisseurs* of poetry. The legend of the decadent poet was already in full swing, and the reputedly satanic writer was amazing the narrow and the unintelligent. The critic believed that this was a part of Baudelaire's diabolic attitude, that he was waiting for the moment when he should be recognized as one of the gods of French poetry. Laujol found the influence of the *Poèmes en prose*, as well as of Banville's *Odes funambulesques*, in *Les Vignes folles*; he did not elaborate, presuming that the reader would know that Glatigny admired Baudelaire and was often, with Leconte de Lisle and Gautier, in company with him.

In the second letter, Laujol treated the problems of form and content.¹³ He criticized those who, in his opinion, were disregarding form in the interest of content, those who were convinced that the primary aim of poetry was the direct and simple expression of the facts and who were negligent in matters of imagery, rhyme, and rhythm. Baudelaire, insisting on the impossibility of the expression of an idea or an emotion without an equally forceful and considered technical procedure, could hardly, on this score, have incurred Laujol's displeasure. The critic, indeed, esteemed Baudelaire as one of the great teachers of this doctrine; he censured those who failed to submit to his discipline as offenders against good taste. Laujol was keenly aware of the existence of a Baudelairean influence. He did not say, however, that there was an *école de Baudelaire*; nor was there a manifesto of any group of poets where his name would be mentioned.

insofar as it was not inimical in intent, but rather, written by an intimate acquaintance and pupil, it attempted to explain Baudelaire's character and literary goals. It did not emphasize the cliché of decadence; the dandyism of the poet was shown in his pretension to be ultramontane when, in reality, Cladel wrote, the poet believed in neither God nor the devil.

¹² Henry Laujol, "Comment le poète Albert Glatigny s'en vint à la conquête de la ville de Paris," *La République des lettres*, Dec. 20, 1875, pp. 28-31.

¹³ Henry Laujol, "Le Parnasse contemporain," *La République des lettres*, Dec. 27, 1875, pp. 92-97.

Laujol attributed the failure of Glatigny and Mendès to issue manifestos to the fact that the public's attention was being turned away from questions of art. He descried the imitation of the older and established poets (especially Hugo, Gautier, Banville); he also included among the major voices those of Leconte de Lisle, Baudelaire, Lamartine, Vigny, and Musset. He would have preferred the idea of work and effort in poetic composition, though he admitted the Romantic concept of the "born poet."

The third letter was essentially commemorative in nature and insisted upon Baudelaire as a counselor to younger poets in questions of poetic discipline.¹⁴ Laujol described the poet as he appeared in the fifties: "tel qu'on l'a connu dans ses années heureuses, affable, discret; plein de dandysme et de malice, avec son grand front qu'encadrait une chevelure élégante, le col très-blanc et un peu lâche de sa chemise, son sourire calme et troublant."¹⁵

Those books which could be called biographies sought more to reveal a curious and original personality than to make acute appraisals of Baudelaire's work. They were written by associates of Baudelaire who, on the whole, were content to portray Baudelaire as an eccentric. Yriarte, for example, saw in him the sick and decadent poet, obsessed with thoughts of death and the grave.¹⁶ Champfleury, more closely associated with Baudelaire from the early forties—the epoch of the *Buveurs d'eau*—protested, in his *Souvenirs et portraits de jeunesse*,¹⁷ against this sort of misunderstanding. He wrote that the intimate friends whom Baudelaire left behind owed "à sa mémoire de la défendre contre les accusations de démente ou d'eccentricité calculée qu'ont pu mettre au compte ceux qui ne l'avaient pas pratiqué pendant de longues années."¹⁸ To prove this he related such anecdotes as Baudelaire's paying the medical bills for Jeanne's illnesses, his taking children on his knee. Feydeau, who would meet with Gautier, Flaubert, Bouilhet, and Baudelaire on Sundays at the table of La Présidente, repeated, in his commemorative volume on Gautier,¹⁹ Sainte-Beuve's phrase that Baudelaire lived in a sort of Chinese pavilion. Gautier, the author of *Fanny* assumed, with his love of the odd and the rare, was the most indulgent to the poet of the *Fleurs*.

Attempts at literary criticism of Baudelaire are infrequent and are not given as parts of serious literary essays. Yriarte did observe the originality in style of the *Fleurs*, which he linked with the great writers of the end of the seventeenth century, probably the first coupling of Baudelaire's work with French classicism. Champfleury's

¹⁴ Henry Laujol, "La Revue fantaisiste," *La République des lettres*, Jan. 4, 1876, pp. 164-68.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 166.

¹⁶ Charles Yriarte (le Marquis de Villemer), "Charles Beaudelaire [sic]," *Les Portraits cosmopolites* (Lachaud, 1870), pp. 115-44.

¹⁷ Champfleury, "Rencontre de Baudelaire," *Souvenirs et portraits de jeunesse* (Dentu, 1872), pp. 131-46.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

¹⁹ Ernest Feydeau, *Théophile Gautier: Souvenirs intimes* (Plon, 1874).

comments that Baudelaire disliked Montaigne, La Fontaine, and Molière and had qualified them as "trop sages" are interesting but lead to no further serious discussion.

A more formal desire to establish a Baudelaire biography was evident in *Charles Baudelaire, essais de bibliographie contemporaine* by Fizilière and Decaux;²⁰ and the Pincebourde volume, *Charles Baudelaire, souvenirs, correspondances* (par le Vte de Spoelberch), *suivis de pièces inédites*, with a *lettre-préface* by Baudelaire's one-time schoolmate at Louis-le-Grand, Charles Cousin.²¹ The first volume widened the area of Baudelaire discussion, limited—as we have seen—to a great extent, to Baudelaire's decadence arising from the Left Bank Bohemia associations. Though of little use today in setting up a Baudelaire bibliography, it gave the background of Baudelaire's father, the early childhood of the poet, the taste for elegance and refinement aroused at that time and which henceforth characterized the author of the *Fleurs*.

What would be hoped for in Fizilière's volume was more apparent in the Pincebourde collection, which was the result of an appeal for unpublished correspondence, unedited fragments, and autographs. Through the Pincebourde collection, according to the publisher's *avertissement*, the reader would be better able to penetrate into the private life, habits, manners, dreams, interests, ideas, and friendships of Baudelaire than he would by reading a regular biography. Cousin wrote that, although a fellow student, he did not remember the poet too well from that time; he best remembered him from the days of the poet's twenties, describing him as "raffiné, paradoxal, bohème et dandy. Dandy surtout, et grand théoricien d'élégance."²²

The contents of the Pincebourde collection are extremely varied: not only personal reminiscence but also interest in the theatre (the letters to Holstein of the *Gaité*); relationships with his contemporaries and their attitude toward him; his interest in Poe.²³ The curiosity was evidently there, yet no critic appeared to take up the task. The most pertinent remarks came from Vigny and Flaubert. Vigny's letter was sent on the occasion of Baudelaire's presenting himself to the Academy. The author of *Stello* had reservations concerning the poems only insofar as there were sometimes too many

²⁰ Librairie de l'Académie des bibliophiles, 1868.

²¹ Pincebourde, 1872.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²³ After the memorial essay came the selections from Baudelaire's correspondence. There were ten letters, written between 1857 and 1861, addressed, with the exception of one to Asselineau, to Poulet-Malassis and were concerned with details of publication. Delacroix's letter, dated 1853, concerned the impressions made on him by the *Exposition universelle*. Several items had primarily to do with Baudelaire's preoccupation with gaining recognition for the artists who, in his estimation, were not sufficiently appreciated: Poe, Meryon, Philibert Rouvière. There was also Taine's answer to the poet's request for a preface to *Eurêka* (March 30, 1865: a question of an article on Poe according to Crépet), which Taine did not care much for. The critic did, however, notice the great fidelity of tone between the original and the translation.

emanations from the graveyard of Hamlet. Flaubert's letter was dated July 13, 1857, evidently upon receiving a copy of the *Fleurs*. Flaubert found that Baudelaire had renewed Romanticism (clearly by turning against the excesses of Romantic "inspiration"); he stressed the poet's originality, in style and in ideas, which brought out the pessimism and harshness toward life (much as did Flaubert himself). Among the poems which Flaubert particularly admired were: *La Beauté*; *L'Idéal*; *La Géante*; the poem which begins with the line, "Avec ses vêtements onduoyants et nacrés"; *La Charogne*; *Le Beau navire*; *A une dame créole*; and *Spleen*.

The theme of decadence persisted even in a collection which was avowedly sympathetic. Auguste Vitu, in the Pincebourde publication, corrected in a few minor details the *Notice* of Gautier. He went on to discuss the *Fleurs*, which he characterized as a strange and magnificent bouquet of Byronic curses, in a language which has had no analogy save in Dante. He explained the choice of themes by the sufferings and illnesses of the poet, who was attracted by the strange and the chimeric. What might be called the height of such criticism was reached by Alfred Charavay in his "Lettre préface à Alfred Bovet," of his *Alfred de Vigny et Charles Baudelaire, candidats à l'Académie française*.²⁴ He wrote that it was his intention to gather together some anecdotes to show the search for the horrible and the unhealthy which did so much to harm the reputation of the maligned poet. Although he had respect for the poet's intelligence, the critic remarked on the influence of the Seine on Baudelaire, telling us that the dreary river must have inspired in the poet lugubrious dreams and poisoned his soul. His extremely acute powers of observation, Charavay added, and the impressionable nature of his genius must have been contributing factors in this process.

Perhaps the generally low level of criticism can be discovered in the inactivity of the poetic scene. Naturalism held forth from *La Fortune des Rougon* in 1870; the Romantic generation was silenced by death, save for Hugo (more admired, perhaps, for his production in novels at this time) and George Sand; Rimbaud was virtually unknown, and Mallarmé published only at intervals and in scattered journals. Parnassianism was in vogue, with Leconte de Lisle as the acknowledged leader, though he did not command a large popular following. For reading pleasure in poetry the public turned to such collections as Coppée's *Les Humbles* (1872). Only the legend of the *décadence baudelairienne* persisted, together with the disquieting impression that the *frisson nouveau* might have implications of a moral or intellectual nature as yet undefined.

It was rather in an indirect manner that Baudelaire's reputation was maintained, in the influence of Poe and in the echoes in verses by struggling poets in frequently even more struggling little magazines, where these poets paid their debt to the *Fleurs*. In the *Renaissance*

²⁴ Charavay frères, 1879.

sance artistique et littéraire, between 1872 and 1874, appeared many of Mallarmé's translations of Poe;²⁵ in the *République des lettres*, in 1876, versions of other poems were published. Rollinat displayed an apparent imitation of Baudelaire; his poems came out in the 1870's and early 1880's under such titles as *Les Agonies lentes* and *La Villanelle du diable*.²⁶ A true understanding of Baudelaire, aside from a didactic one or from anecdote, one of perceiving Baudelaire as speaking in "a confessional manner" as Laforgue was to write in 1885, was not seen until Bourget's essay on Baudelaire was printed in 1881, in *La Nouvelle Revue*.²⁷

Bourget, born in 1851, belonged to a generation which included both those who underestimated Baudelaire's achievement—Faguet, Brunetière, Jules Lemaitre—as well as those who saw Baudelaire as a motivating force in writing verse—Richepin, Rodenbach, Verhaeren, Rollinat. Bourget published in the seventies books of verse which gained for him some reputation as a poet. What he had to say about the maligned writer will win attention among readers who recall *Edel* and its young author. The pessimism which marks the tone of these collections, really a sense of despondency, attracted Bourget's interest to the *Fleurs*. Bourget succeeded in pointing out what anecdote and preoccupation with decadence failed to emphasize, that Baudelaire's modernism was effective in that it represented a personal *crise de conscience* in the struggle between spirituality, intellectuality, and sensualism. Until Bourget's essay this dilemma was not generally perceived, criticism having remained on a level of the poet of satanism, dandyism, and morbidity which only a finer intelligence could redefine in a framework of their importance to the gravity of the poems and the seriousness of their intent. This was achieved by Bourget.

Bourget saw in the work of the older writer a criticism of society similar to that later developed in his novels. Taine's phrase that literature is a "living psychology" was adopted by Bourget, who discussed the pessimism of the nineteenth century in a series of essays devoted to Baudelaire, Renan, Flaubert, Taine, and Stendhal. The one on the author of the *Fleurs* consisted of three parts and described Baudelaire as "mystique, libertin et analyseur." In general this concept was close to the personal crisis which confronted the heroes of Bourget's own novels, such as *Le Disciple* or *L'Étape*. The interior debate was comparable and drew Bourget to Baudelaire. He found a contrast running all through the aberrations and disorders of

²⁵ Cf. Cornell, p. 19.

²⁶ Later Rollinat was discredited by Barbey in an article written for *Le Constitutionnel* for June 1, 1882 (published as "Rollinat," in *XIX^e siècle*, II: *Les Œuvres et les hommes: Les Poètes*, by Lemerre in 1889, pp. 321-44). Barbey admired in Baudelaire "l'homme au haschisch des Paradis artificiels" and thought of him as essentially religious; he affirmed that Rollinat was inferior in technique and had feeling only for the superficial aspects of "diabolisme."

²⁷ Paul Bourget, "Baudelaire," *La Nouvelle Revue*, November, 1881, pp. 398-416.

Baudelaire's life, between the desire for purity and the temptations of the flesh. At the same time, this dilemma of "mysticité" and "libertinage" is clearly perceived by the power of the intelligence which remains in control of itself; it also acts as a prism to break down all religious questionings and interpretations of society into these two component phases.

Bourget's interpretation was quite sociological and close to Taine's generalization that, proceeding from the man as an artist, a critic can perceive in him a product which only a certain society could give rise to. Bourget wrote that it was typical of the century that one should find the end of a religious faith, the influence of city life, the scientific spirit; and more so that they should be found in one man. Again the future novelist had already conceived the character of his modern hero in the poet of the *Fleurs*. Even in the nineteenth century, century of impiety, Bourget was convinced that enough faith remained that the child could absorb an "amour mystique," which—though cast from the intelligence—could return in moments of reflection or emotional stress. From this experience, taken together with the libertine tendencies of city life (which furnished a setting, as did Catholicism), the life of a man of letters in the literary Bohemia of the capital, and the idea of love which is "mystique, sensuel et intelligent," flowed the terrible stream of corrosive spleen.

Closely connected with the origin of spleen is Baudelaire's pessimism, which leads to nihilism, according to Bourget; it is the end or purpose of his "libertinage analytique." For Bourget, who considered Baudelaire in the tradition of pessimism in Romantic and Parnassian literature, the poet of the *Fleurs* did not lament a past happiness (Musset) nor did he long for a distant one (Leconte de Lisle). Rather the pessimism of the poems derived from the cursing of one's own existence, from a mind and sensitivity sunk in nihilism, and was intimately connected with the poet's concept of God. For Baudelaire, God is a sort of father or companion: when the poet is left alone in the world, this faith cracks, and all sorts of pleasures come through. The only release is death.

Baudelaire's great originality, then, for Bourget, lay in his going further in the analysis of how debauchery kills pleasure. One must admit that Bourget saw in Baudelaire, much as did Gautier, the spirit of bravado and a search for the morbid and artificial which fits in with the concept of the decadent of the 1880's. Bourget's definition, however, was based more on the demands and conditions of the social situation in which a writer finds himself. For the critic, decadence is defined as that state of society which produces too great a number of individuals who cannot take their respective places in the world's workaday life. Insofar as influence goes, Bourget perceived the influence of Baudelaire in the moral atmosphere of the day; it was thus a more difficult one to trace than Balzac's or Musset's. The tempta-

tion was an emotional one: a new manner of practicing *libertinage* by the inspection of one's own heart.

With Bourget's essay, Baudelaire became a modern: he assumed the position that each generation was to know his verse according to its own poetic or moral or intellectual needs. Bourget, the serious young man who came from the provinces to make his literary fortune in the capital, had no personal axe to grind. He was not of Baudelaire's age, nor did he judge the poet as a literary curiosity or as a minor figure in nineteenth-century literature. He found in Baudelaire a subject close to his own heart and problems. As distinguished from earlier criticism of a moralistic nature, or from the merely anecdotal—which stressed too patently the theme of decadence—Bourget's is literary and has the marks of the best of future attempts to understand the *Fleurs du mal* and their author: a seriousness and sincerity of discussion in acknowledgment of Baudelaire's greatness.

Honnold Library, Claremont College

PRONOUNS OF ADDRESS IN THE "FRIAR'S TALE"

By NORMAN NATHAN

While there have been various studies on the use of the pronouns of address in Middle English, no one has as yet examined in detail Chaucer's "use of *ye* in the function of *thou*" in any of the *Canterbury Tales*.¹ Scholars would no doubt agree that Chaucer was aware and made use of this distinction, but a critical and statistical analysis of usage in the various tales remains to be done.

The present paper will deal exclusively with the "Friar's Tale," which has been selected for several reasons: (1) the variety of uses and problems raised are typical of those in most of the tales; (2) "No definite source of the *Friar's Tale* has been found, or is likely to be,"² and it would appear that the proper use of each pronoun of address is not attributable merely to literal translating; (3) the switch back and forth from formal to informal occurs so many times that correct usage could result only from care on the part of the poet; (4) this tale illustrates perhaps better than any other that Chaucer was able to turn a grammatical convention into a tool for striking dramatic and satirical effect; (5) the teacher-scholar may find this story advantageous in showing the student that a study of scholarly minutiae can make a work of art more enjoyable.

Skeat provided a brief but suitable guide for interpreting correct usage. "*Thou* is the language of a lord to a servant, of an equal to an equal, and expresses also companionship, love, permission, defiance, scorn, threatening: whilst *ye* is the language of a servant to a lord, and of compliment, and further expresses honour, submission, or entreaty."³ At first glance the characters in the "Friar's Tale" may appear to speak their *ye*'s and *thou*'s haphazardly. Careful examination shows, however, that in all but one of ninety instances (the prologue is not considered here) usage is in accord with the pattern given by Skeat.

In describing the summoner in this tale, the friar quotes him as using the informal in addressing laymen coming under his jurisdiction (1363 ff.).⁴ This is clearly the case of a superior talking to an inferior.

Several lines later the summoner meets a devil who addresses him

¹ Arthur G. Kennedy, *The Pronoun of Address in English Literature of the Thirteenth Century*, Stanford University Publications, University Series (1915); Russell Osborne Stidston, *The Use of Ye in the Function of Thou*, Stanford University Publications, University Series (1917); Charles C. Walcutt, "The Pronoun of Address in *Troilus and Criseyde*," *PQ*, XIV (1935), 282-87.

² F. N. Robinson, ed., *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 809.

³ W. W. Skeat, ed., *Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), V, 175.

⁴ Line numbers and quotations from Chaucer are from the Robinson edition.

informally as an equal (1386 ff.). Since the devil appears to be but an ordinary character, the summoner uses the same form (1392). But the devil soon boasts of his great wealth, and wealth demands respect, particularly from one of the summoner's character.

"Brother," quod he, "where is now youre dwellyng
Another day if that I sholde yow seche?" (1410-11)

Shortly after, the devil admits that he is not so well off as he pretended. He may have gold and silver in his chest, but his wages are small. The summoner realizes that his companion is as big a faker as he is and immediately returns to the informal singular:

"But, leeve brother, tel me thanne thy name,"
Quod this somonour. (1444-45)

The devil thereupon admits his identity: "I am a feend; my dwellyng is in helle. . . ." Now the summoner must switch to the polite form of address (1456 ff.), for an evil-doer will respect an even greater evil-doer than he himself is.

An amusing, though not explicit, comment on human nature occurs in the next switch. The devil tells him that he will one day be his equal and offers to make a companion of the summoner.

"But o thyng warne I thee, I wol nat jape,—
Thou wolt algates wite how we been shape;
Thou shalt hereafterward, my brother deere,
Come there thee nedeth nat of me to leere.
For thou shalt, by thyn owene experience,
Konne in a chayer rede of this sentence
Bet than Virgile, while he was on lyve,
Or Dant also. Now lat us ryde blyve,
For I wole holde compaignye with thee
Til it be so that thou forsake me."
(1513-22)

In view of these promises the summoner sees no need to respect his superior and returns to the informal singular (1526 ff.).

This continues until they stop at the old woman's house. The summoner addresses her as an inferior, while she properly shows respect for his office. However, the purpose of the summoner's visit becomes apparent to her when he asks for twelve pence as the price of absolution. The accusation that she has been unfaithful to her husband arouses the woman's anger. She appropriately changes to the impolite form of address:

"Thou list!" quod she, "by my savacioun,
Ne was I nevere er now, wydwe ne wyf;
Somed unto youre court in al my lyf;
Ne nevere I nas but of my body trewe!
Unto the devel blaak and rough of hewe
Yeve I thy body and my panne also!"
(1618-23)

Your court is not a temporary reverting to polite address, for *your* refers to the court of summoners.

The woman has just expressed the wish that her accuser's body go to the devil. And the devil, hearing this, cannot but be grateful. Therefore, in order to thank her for the present, he shows her a rare courtesy by calling her his mother and using the polite form of address:

"Now, Mabely, myn owene mooder deere,
Is this youre wyl in earnest that ye seye?"
(1626-27)

From the above it is apparent that Chaucer, in the "Friar's Tale" at least, uses the pronoun of address most carefully in its formal and informal aspects in order to achieve irony and humor.

In the Robinson text (and also in the Manly-Rickert⁵) there are two instances which may require explanation and one which appears to remain the sole exception to correct usage. The devil says to the summoner:

"Nay, certeinly," quod he, "ther have we noon;
But whan us liketh, we kan take us oon,
Or elles make yow seme we been shape
Somtyme lyk a man, or lyk an ape,
Or lyk an angel kan I ryde or go.
It is no wonder thyng thogh it be so;
A lowsy jogelour kan deceyve thee,
And pardee, yet kan I moore craft than he."
(1461-68)

Make yow follows *we kan*, that is, "you summoners" and "we devils." But *deceyve thee* refers only to the particular summoner, for the devil two lines before switched from *we* to *I*. Thus there is no inconsistency in the above passage.

For line 1399 Robinson and Manly-Rickert print a reading that would be an exception if it were the true reading. The devil, where he should use the informal, says, "And eek of bretherhede, if that yow leste." Manuscript evidence, on a purely numerical basis, shows that *yow* is a minority reading. Of the fifty-five manuscripts containing the line, thirteen have *yow*, one has *yee*, ten have *the*, and thirty-one have *thou*.⁶ But this three-to-one ratio may not be meaningful if the smaller group of manuscripts possess greater authority. Manly and Rickert write, "El, Hg, a [Cn, Dd, Ds, En¹, and Ma], and Gg are for the most part derived from a better text."⁷ Of this group, El, Hg, and Gg are in the formal; whereas Cn, Dd, Ds, En¹ and Ma are in the informal. The case, therefore, would seem by no means to favor the formal in line 1399. Another method helpful in deciding upon a correct reading is the priority in time of the texts. Of the manuscripts definitely written before 1430, the formal appears in Cp, El, Ha⁴, and

⁵ John M. Manly and Edith Rickert, ed., *The Text of the Canterbury Tales*, 8 vols. (Chicago, 1940).

⁶ *Ibid.*, VI, 144.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 44.

Hg, while the informal occurs in Dd, He, La, and Pw. And Ha⁴ "is never authoritative."⁸

Thus, whether the manuscripts are viewed quantitatively or qualitatively, the presumption is, if anything, in favor of the formal. Since the "Friar's Tale" is almost perfect in its use of the pronouns of address, and since the use of the informal in line 1399 is a more desirable reading, it would appear reasonable to set aside the Manly-Rickert reading as unlikely.

There is, nevertheless, one instance that seems to be a slip of Chaucer's pen. The devil says:

"Lo, brother," quod the feend, "what tolde I thee?
Heere may ye se, myn owene deere brother,
The carl spak oo thing, but he thoghte another."
(1566-68)

May ye is incorrect. Only six manuscripts have the proper wording *maist thou*.⁹ It would seem plausible to conclude that these six are correcting an original exception, particularly since five of them (Bo¹, Ad¹, En², Ht, Ph²) date from the latter half of the fifteenth century and the sixth (Ps), while earlier, was written under the supervision of Jean d'Angoulême who, as a Frenchman and a member of the nobility, would be likely to insist upon correct usage of the pronouns of address.

Thus it appears after a detailed analysis of the "Friar's Tale" that Chaucer is remarkably consistent in his use of the pronoun of address, that correct usage becomes an effective dramatic tool, and that apparent exceptions often disappear upon closer investigation. Further, it is clear that the English language lost something by the abandonment of the singular form of the pronoun of address and that a modernized version of the *Canterbury Tales* is forced to ignore the subtle effects Chaucer produced by his skillful manipulation of *ye's* and *thou's*.

Is Chaucer, in his other tales, as consistent in his use of the pronouns of address as he is in the "Friar's Tale"? Generally, yes. The vast majority show approximately one lapse per hundred usages. However, the prose tales, those of the Canon Yeoman and the Knight, and the "Wife of Bath's Prologue," have a much larger proportion of errors. The writer hopes at some future date to deal with all of the tales, not merely to produce statistics but also to add to the available evidence as to dating and Chaucerian authorship.¹⁰

Utica College, Syracuse University

⁸ Manly-Rickert, I, 222.

⁹ *Ibid.*, VI, 161.

¹⁰ This paper is a result of a suggestion sixteen years ago by Carleton Brown. He conjectured that an investigation of the usage of the pronouns of address might help to date some of the tales.

ALIEN MILITARY DOCTRINE IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND

By PAUL A. JORGENSEN

In our study of the foreign enlightenment that came to England during the Renaissance, we are apt to slight what was possibly its most recently acquired art—the art of war. And we are apt to neglect it for the very reason that made it so remarkable: its far from brilliant sponsorship. Those who pleaded for an English art of war were meagerly literate soldiers and patriotic translators who, unlike their countrymen, recognized in alien cultures the discipline, strategy, and science responsible for enemy successes in Continental wars. For their foresight and zeal, if not for the multitude of dreary books in which their efforts now lie hidden, it may prove worth while to pay tribute to the work of these little-known men: to inquire into the difficulties they faced in breaking down an English military provincialism, and to show how they went about naturalizing the resources of several different countries and epochs for national defense.

One need not read far into Elizabethan literature to learn what most Englishmen cherished in their military tradition. A few manly soldiers, using simple tactics, inevitably humiliate a multitude of more artful foreigners. The typical conquest is that of Shakespeare's Henry V, whose "happy few" prevailed "without stratagem, / But in plain shock and even play of battle."¹ An apprentice in Heywood's *Edward IV* is prepared to guard London in a way that presumably reassured his hearers:

We have no trickes nor policies of warre,
But by the antient custom of our fathers,
We'll soundly lay it on.²

That this noble tradition had a damaging effect upon contemporary fighting is suggested by the engagements described by Sir Roger Williams, in which gallant Englishmen were no match for an enemy superior in feints, delays, parleys, and maneuvers.³

Of the foreign literatures which military reformers drew upon to correct this dangerous situation, the biblical was the least promising, but not the least important. Although it certainly did not contain the kind of doctrine that military students would have ordered, no propagandist could neglect the Bible as an ally, however troublesome. The difficulty with Hebraic military philosophy was that it encouraged precisely those English notions most inimical to an art of war. Here

¹ *King Henry the Fifth*, IV, viii, 113-14. Shakespeare references are to the *Complete Works*, ed. Kittredge (Boston, 1936).

² *1 Edward IV*, in *Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood*, ed. R. H. Shepherd (London, 1874), I, 17.

³ *Actions of the Lowe Countries* (1616), pp. 69 ff.

was available the comforting doctrine of a chosen nation winning not by military stratagem but by some special favor, and winning against great odds. Ministers, who regarded the sins of England as her greatest enemies, urged a spiritual armament in national crises, and mass repentance rather than military training. "Then," argues one of them typically, "shal ye be stronger than your enemies be they never so manie. . . . Then shall Goliath fall downe before David, & Sennacherib before Hesekias."⁴ When, according to another devotional author, generals ascribe victories to warlike stratagems, God "besotteth their devises, and maketh their policies of none effect."⁵ The most popular Hebrew exemplum was that of Moses; indeed, most official interpretations of the Armada defeat, including the Queen's authorized prayer, give credit only to a provident marshaling of the elements, much in the manner of Exodus.⁶

Despite such poor auspices, military spokesmen used biblical history to good advantage. Sir John Smythe reasoned that although God alone could defeat Pharaoh, He nevertheless instructed Moses "how he should reduce the Israelites unto a well ordered Militia, before they should attempt the besieging and winning of Cities and townes . . . that it might be a continual instruction unto them and all other princes and governours . . . to establish lawes, orders & exercises military."⁷ Biblical citations favorable to strategy were eagerly sought by martial writers. One chaplain pointed out that, although Christians must not ordinarily use "guileful policie," the Bible warrants its use when there is "so good a way with so little blood to take speedie vengeance of God's enemies."⁸ Lodowick Lloyd collected biblical stratagems into a book, *The Stratagems of Jerusalem*, in which he reconciles divine strategy with human policy by showing, as he declares in his dedication to Robert Cecil, that "all stratagems, victories, & good counsel commeth from the Lord,"⁹ although one might captiously object that plaguing Pharaoh with frogs is not, as Lloyd classifies it, a military stratagem. Well-meaning but old-fashioned ministers, to be sure, might inadvertently draw detrimental lessons from Scripture, as did one who saw in the Lord's promise to "make his arrowes drunke" with enemy blood, an encouragement of the English use of

⁴ John Carpenter, *Time Complaining* (1588), sig. A6.

⁵ John Norden, *The Mirror of Honor* (1597), p. 73.

⁶ Cf. *Queen Elisabeth's Prayer of Thanksgiving, for the overthrow of the Spanish Navy, sent to invade England, Anno 1588*, in *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer*, ed. for the Parker Society (Cambridge, 1847).

⁷ *Instructions, Observations, and Orders Myltitarie* (1595), Epistle Dedicatorie, ¶ 3.

⁸ Simon Harward, *Solace for the Souldier and Saylour* (1592), sig. D2. Similarly Stephen Gosson learned from biblical wars that "al the meanes are lawfull that are requisite to the attaining of the victory, sleights, shifts, stratagems, burning, wasting, spoiling, undermining, battery, blows and blood." *The Trumpet of Warre* (1598), sig. C5.

⁹ *The Stratagems of Jerusalem* (1602), sig. A2^v. Lloyd also points out that "all nations of the world had their first instruction from the Hebrewes, as well their military discipline, as martiall lawes" (sig. Y4^v).

bow and arrow.¹⁰ But on the whole, military apologists succeeded in converting the Bible to a useful library of war literature, whereby they showed that England, no less than Israel, needed military knowledge as well as divine sponsorship.

Regardless of Hebraic moral prestige, it was the Greeks and Romans among antiquity who best exemplified martial learning; and in the military aspect of the English Renaissance almost all classics dealing with war were translated. The fortune of Caesar's *Commentaries* is typical. During the sixteenth century alone four editions were published in English. Golding, as Henry J. Webb has noticed, regarded his volume as an exposition upon the art of war; and when in 1600 Edmondes both translated Caesar's text and commented upon its military art, the resultant book ran through five editions in ten years.¹¹ There was a patriotic anxiety to disseminate the ancient knowledge; did not these works contain the secrets responsible for the rise and fall of empires? One writer was concerned that other nations, and not the English, were beginning to exploit these secrets;¹² and the alarming successes of the Turks, who benefited from classical discipline, helped to drive the lesson home. C. H. Conley even sees a political urgency behind some of the translations. He cites the governmental concern when Brend died before completing his Caesar, and Cecil brought the uncompleted book to Golding to finish.¹³

But what, one wonders, did the English find of practical worth in these antique precepts of war, with their fancy formations, the rhomb, wedge, and square, their "wheeling, double, and treble wheeling of a bataile"?¹⁴ Admittedly many of the classical enthusiasts had only a nostalgic sentiment for an older, more decorous warfare. Proctor, among many, is sonorous rather than precise in eulogizing "the auncient orders & government of warre... the examples of the antiquitie, the experience, pollicies, prudent counsailes, most profitable and pitthye precepts, and admonishmentes, most excellent experimentes, instructyons, behaviours & discipline of the greatest chyftaines."¹⁵ Here is the grandiose erudition parodied in Shakespeare's Fluellen, who solemnly promises that in Pompey's camp "you shall find the ceremonies of the wars, and the cares of it, and the forms of it, and the sobriety of it, and the modesty of it."¹⁶ But despite the battle of the books which the experts waged among themselves con-

¹⁰ Edmond Harris, *A Sermon Preached at Brocket Hall* (1588), sig. A6.

¹¹ H. J. Webb, "English Translations of Caesar's *Commentaries* in the Sixteenth Century," *PQ*, XXVIII (1949), 490-95.

¹² Thomas Farnaby's tribute to Philemon Holland's translation of Xenophon's *Cyrupædia* (1632), sig. A1.

¹³ C. H. Conley, *First English Translators of the Classics* (New Haven, 1927), pp. 47-48.

¹⁴ *Tacticks of Ælian Or Art of Embattailing an Army after the Grecian Manner, Englished...* by J.B. (1616), sig. A3v.

¹⁵ Thomas Proctor, *Of the Knowledge and Conducte of Warres* (1578), Preface.

¹⁶ *King Henry the Fifth*, IV, i, 72-75.

cerning the modern relevance of the classics, and despite the ridicule which it brought them, classical military writers exerted a salubrious influence upon the nation at large. In them, citizens learned to respect strategy and discipline, whether ancient or modern. The military classics rightly came to symbolize the ideas described in the title of one of the most influential of them, Frontinus' *The Strategemes, Sleyghtes, and Policies of Warre*. In dedicating his translation to Henry VIII, Morison pointed out the governing moral of the work: "Many mo fieldes have ben lost for lacke of polycie, than for wante of strength, many townes wonne by sleighes, whyche a longe season easilye were kepte ageynst greattest myght." "The noble capitaynes of England, have oft declared," he tactfully adds, "that they lytell nede any instructions, any bokes, to teach them to touse their enemies," yet it will hurt no man to learn how "to invente newe polycies, and wysely to use the olde."¹⁷ The "Sleyghtes" described by Frontinus are of the sort usually practiced by villains in Elizabethan drama: "To set enemies at divisyon," "Of traynes and disceites," "To dissemble retreat." Here captains learned that it is better to conquer by starving the enemy or by unexpected attacks than "with fyghting in playne battayle"¹⁸—a far cry from Henry V's "plain shock and even play of battle." More congenial to English tradition would have been the Greek doctrine that John Bingham, a soldier garrisoned in Holland, gives in presenting his *Ælian*: "that the moments of victory rested not in the hands of multitudes, but in a few men rightly instructed to manage armes."¹⁹ Where Hebraic doctrine had guaranteed victory to a righteous few, Greek and Roman history demonstrated how a disciplined militia might overcome a multitude. From both cultures, Elizabethans learned much of value in modifying, though not subduing, their bold trust in the power of a single Englishman.

It was in Renaissance Italy, as F. L. Taylor shows, that the art of war achieved its "truly scientific spirit," with its specialized illumination of gunnery and fortification.²⁰ But the English studied contemporary Italian treatises much less than those written centuries before in the same country. Elizabethans might ape the Italians in dress and poetry, but instruction in fighting was another matter. Among similar stories, George Silver proudly relates how "a verie tall gentleman of his handes, not standing much upon his skill, but carrying the valiant hart of an Englishman" challenged Signor Rocco, the master of fencing, to come out and fight: "thou that takest upon thee to come over the seas to teach the valiant Noblemen and Gentle-

¹⁷ *Strategemes, Sleyghtes, and Policies of Warre, gathered togeyther, by S. Julius Frontinus, and translated into Englyshe, by Rycharde Morysine* (1539), sigs. A4^v-A5.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Table of Contents and sig. N6^v.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, sig. A1.

²⁰ *Art of War in Italy, 1494-1529* (Cambridge, 1921), p. 157.

mien of England to fight."²¹ Deference to this sort of prejudice is evident in Peter Whitehorne's remarks on his translation of Machiavelli's *Arte of Warre*, in which he hopes that his author will make Englishmen "no less in knowledge of warres become incomparable, then in prowes also and excercise of the same altogether invincible."²²

Machiavelli, in fact, is the most interesting example of how even the most distasteful of alien doctrine made its way into English military thought. Here, as usual, it was a humble but determined soldier who managed to give the Florentine an entry well before his political creed had become anathema, and a full eighty years before Dacres apologetically presented the first English translation of *The Prince*. Peter Whitehorne, having learned much from the *Arte of Warre*, felt it his duty to present his translation to the Queen herself, "boldly affirming," as he wrote, "that of many strangers, which from forrein countries, have here tofore in this your majesties realme arrived, there is none in comparison to bee preferred, before this worthie Florentine." Today the whole dedication seems ill advised, yet there is possibly less irony than one might at first think in his prediction that his author "shall deserve . . . of all good English hartes, most lovingly and frendely to be intertained, embraced, and cherished."²³ Machiavelli's military doctrine was indeed embraced, though the three editions of Whitehorne's translation (one of them for the crisis of 1588) are untypical signs of its cordial entertainment. Most of Machiavelli was exploited without credit. Unlike the Bible and the classics, he was an authority whom it soon became undesirable to cite. But it is probable that from Whitehorne's very book came some of the Queen's later canniness, sometimes mistaken for ineptitude, in the politics of war: her seemingly capricious alternation of generals, her suspicion of those who made war their career, and her balancing of advocates of peace with advocates of war. The more or less silently accepted kind of influence is also noticeable in military authors like Rich and Garrard, who make Machiavelli into part of their art of war. Rich effectually naturalizes the Florentine by substituting his own historical examples for those in the original.²⁴ Similarly Bacon, Raleigh, and Milton draw copiously from both the *Arte of Warre* and the military *Discorsi*.²⁵ But those who refer to him openly are obliged to deplore him as the caricature he had become in statecraft. One seventeenth-century religious-military writer, while absurdly

²¹ *Paradoxes of Defence* (1599), Shakespeare Association Facsimiles, No. 6 (Oxford, 1933), p. 65.

²² *The Arte of Warre*, trans. Peter Whitehorne (1560), Tudor Translations, XXXIX (London, 1905), 8.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁴ See H. J. Webb, "Barnabe Riche—Sixteenth Century Military Critic," *JEGP*, XLII (1943), 251.

²⁵ Bacon's indebtedness is well known. For Raleigh, see Vincent Luciani, "Raleigh's *Discourse of War* and Machiavelli's *Discorsi*," *MP*, XLVI (1948), 122-31. For Milton, see J. H. Hanford, "Milton and the Art of War," *SP*, XVIII (1921), 238.

attributing to him a preference for roistering, godless soldiers, slips deftly from a reference to him personally to a reference to "the Matchiavellist."²⁶

Prejudice against receiving military instruction from Spain was possibly even greater. All that most Elizabethans cared to read concerning the Spanish army were reports of its cruelty and its defeats, and there were many news-pamphlets for this purpose.²⁷ One of the most popular narratives of the age was Richard Pike's *Three to One*, recounting the victory of the doughty Pike himself, armed only with a good English quarterstaff, over three Spaniards using rapiers and poniards. In view of the obvious tactical superiority of the Spaniard, it is curious to notice the popular complacency appealed to by John Thorius in his English translation of Valdes' *Sergeant Major*. His reason for translating the book, he declares, is not that he thinks Spaniards superior in warfare to his countrymen, "who are no whit inferiour to any of them," but simply to lessen their menace by making their tactics known.²⁸ Furthermore, the English were so repelled by Spanish tactics as to make conscious imitation impossible. The Queen herself, not ungifted in the art of deceit, expressed a noble contempt for Spanish treachery, admonishing a general that "the Spaniards, for all their boasts, will trust more to their devices than anything to be done by force."²⁹ Gonsalo Fernandes' dictum that a general must win regardless of the means, was soberly classified by one writer as "a Spanish principle."³⁰

Only a few Spanish treatises were translated for English instruction,³¹ and it is possible that English soldiers learned their Spanish lessons mainly from combat. What the Spanish had to teach was not, like Italian science, a bookish matter. Much of their success stemmed simply from brilliant generals. A good part of it, none the less, lay in army organization and discipline; and for presenting these virtues to his countrymen, even at the peak of hostility between the nations, Sir Roger Williams was largely responsible. Williams spoke from a valuable vantage point, having served under the King of Spain. With only one or two concessions to popular prejudice—such as deprecating Spanish cowardice—Williams speaks out boldly for Parma's army: "To speake troth, no Armie that ever I saw, passes [it] for discipline and good order."³² It was Williams' book, according to M. J. D. Cockle, that finally put an end to the use of the long-bow in the English service.³³

²⁶ A. L., *Speculum Belli Sacri* (1624), pp. 27-28.

²⁷ A listing of such news-pamphlets may be found in D. C. Collins, *Handlist of News Pamphlets, 1590-1610* (London, 1943).

²⁸ *A Dialogue of the Office of Sergeant Major* (1590), sig. A2.

²⁹ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, Nov. 24, 1596, p. 308.

³⁰ Robert Barret, *Theorike and Practike of Moderne Warres* (1598), p. 172.

³¹ These are described by Martin Hume, *Spanish Influence on English Literature* (London, 1905), pp. 206-13.

³² *A Briefe Discourse of Warre* (1590), p. 10.

³³ M. J. D. Cockle, *Bibliography of English Military Books* (London, 1900), p. 39.

To what extent, in general, did alien doctrines leave their mark on English military theory? A glance at our basic military vocabulary, dating from the Renaissance, will provide the shortest answer. For the names of offices, units, and weapons there is scarcely a native English word to be found. It is true that even after foreign practices and offices had become part of the English army, the resistance of conservatives took the form of opposing the use of foreign terminology for what had been borrowed. Sir John Smythe, an old-fashioned militarist, refused to believe that "our English Nation, which hath been so famous in all actions Militarie manie hundred yeres . . . were not able of it selfe, or by derivation to afford convenient words."⁸⁴ The ultimate triumph of the alien vocabulary, and all that it symbolized, did not so much prove that Smythe was wrong. England could still, if it insisted, have invented its own vocabulary. It proved something more important: that England had at last accepted, more or less consciously, the need for leaving Agincourt and entering the cosmopolitan stream of military science. In 1610 a Briton in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* is able to boast, as he would not have done ten years earlier:

Our countrymen
Are men more order'd than when Julius Caesar
Smil'd at their lack of skill but found their courage
Worth his frowning at. Their discipline
(Now wing-led with their courages) will make known
To their approvers they are people such
That mend upon the world. (II, iv, 20-26)

University of California, Los Angeles

⁸⁴ Sir John Smythe, *Certain Discourses Concerning Weapons* (1590), fol. 2.

THE AIMS, AUDIENCE, AND STRUCTURE OF THE DRAPIER'S FOURTH LETTER

By CARL R. WOODRING

Many an undergraduate has noticed for himself that the famous satires of Dean Swift lack the sleek rotundity of form he had been led to expect in neoclassical masterworks. In Swift he has found Reason, but he has not found graceful line enclosing obvious symmetry. Part of the overrichness of such works as *A Tale of a Tub* derives from the turbulent wealth overflowing Swift's mind. Important contributing causes in most of his richest satires, however, are the diversity of his aims and the multifariousness of his audience. As a perfectionist in form, Swift wished to have proper words in proper places expressing a proper argument reasonably developed. But the driving force in nearly all his writings was Swift the reformer, the propagandist, the humanitarian with intense political experience, the Churchman, and the sensitive, emotional man. It is the purpose of the present paper to demonstrate the effect of Swift's diverse aims and multifarious audience on the structure of *A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland*. It will be necessary, incidentally, to examine a question frequently ignored: Who were "the Whole People of Ireland"?

Largely discounting the *Drapier's Letters* as outside Swift's general literary and rhetorical practice, Harold D. Kelling has lucidly explained how Swift, "working on reason" in accordance with classical principles of rhetoric, appealed to the passions in order that readers might be moved to see by the light of their own reason.¹ This method of persuasion is employed in the *Drapier's Letters*. It was also in accordance with classical rhetorical theory that Swift sought to make his arguments seem probable for the specific audience addressed. But often Swift wished by means of a single document to persuade different groups in his audience to react in different ways to the same argument. By examining a work addressed by Swift to an unusually diverse audience, we can learn something about Gulliver's indirections. Swift followed at once an inherent impulse and an essential technique when he darted side-glances at contemporaries in works dedicated to Prince Posterity. Our delight in reading the Drapier's fourth letter can itself be enhanced if we observe both the skill with which Swift turned from one segment of his audience to another and the energy with which he combined political, personal, and literary aims.

¹ Harold D. Kelling, "The Appeal to Reason: A Study of Jonathan Swift's Critical Theory and Its Relation to His Writings," unpublished dissertation (Yale, 1948). Much more than Kelling or John M. Bullitt, *Jonathan Swift and the Anatomy of Satire* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), a third recent study—Martin Price, *Swift's Rhetorical Art: A Study in Structure and Meaning* (New

I

This pamphlet, *A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland*, illustrates not only well but lavishly the conflict of aims and the apparent confusion of structure in a typical political document by Swift. Since addressing the Drapier's first homely letter to "the Shop-Keepers, Tradesmen, Farmers, and Common-People of Ireland" in order, first, to excite his readers against "the Brass Half-Pence," and, second, to advise tradesmen how with impunity they might avoid passing or accepting the halfpence, Swift's aims, as well as the audience for whom he writes, have now become challengingly complex.² He repeats, for all who are marooned in Ireland, that it is not compulsory that they accept the "base metal"; but he emphasizes, for both highly placed friends and still more highly placed foes, his assurance that neither the granting of the patent to Wood nor insistence upon making the patent succeed can possibly prove to be a wise gesture. Both the style and the intrusion of this new content, meant for a limited audience, distinguish the later complex letters from the Drapier's first two exemplars of art hiding art. Oftener than its more narrowly addressed forerunners, paradoxically, the letter to "the Whole People of Ireland" turns suddenly to ogle or leer at individual readers or at small components of the audience.

Swift addresses this fourth letter to the whole people, but as always more particularly for the English in Ireland. Affairs have gone well. The letter is timed exactly to greet the new Lord Lieutenant, Baron Carteret, an old if not close friend of Swift himself.³ At times he addresses himself to Walpole and the Whig authorities, to Lord Carteret, and, with less justification perhaps, to personal coteries. He writes for persuasion, encouragement, intimidation, entertainment, aesthetic satisfaction, self-defense, and self-expression (or, as the social scientist puts it, self-relief). He writes to reassure those "who have had the *Misfortune* to be born in this Island," not only to rally them within sight of victory over Wood's patent and to point out to them once more the position they can take legally and safely as loyal subjects of the King, but also, now, to anger them into asserting their right to a better life, indeed to independence—mutual independence, he says, from England.

Ostensibly, the Drapier's fourth letter is an answer to two paragraphs reported in Irish newspapers and to two pamphlets published in England, which, according to the Drapier (p. 80), "the Whole

Haven, 1953)—treats the *Drapier's Letters* as illustrative of Swift's general methods.

² On the worthiness of Swift's motives, long challenged, see A. Goodwin, "Wood's Halfpence," *EHR*, LI (1936), 647-74.

³ See *Drapier's Letters to the People of Ireland against receiving Wood's Halfpence*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1935), p. xli. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations and page references used in the present paper are taken from this edition.

People of Ireland" cannot have seen. Thus he confessedly writes partly to persuade a somewhat different audience from that addressed on the title page. The first thirty paragraphs answer four points raised in the newspapers. Swift first answers three charges that had appeared together: "We" in Ireland "dispute the King's Prerogative, are grown Ripe for Rebellion, and ready to shake off the Dependency of Ireland upon the Crown of England" (p. 68). Between these answers, employing skillful transitions, he refutes a fourth point made elsewhere by the supporters of Wood: "That his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant is coming over to settle *Wood's Half-pence*." Next he deals with a separately published anti-Irish pamphlet. In the concluding six paragraphs, he derides the threat of Walpole's wrath as cited in a pro-Irish pamphlet printed at Bristol. The Drapier claims no further principles of organization; he is disposing one by one of recent answerers. His letter takes its purported form from the usual organization of "answering" pamphlets, much as *Gulliver's Travels* takes a form from the predictable sequence of disclosures in contemporary travel books.

II

Since this ostensible structure as an answering pamphlet has been ignored, it is clearly not as such a pamphlet that the fourth letter has taken its high place in our literature. Nor has this or any other letter of the Drapier been nominated as a belletristic equal of the *Modest Proposal* or the *Petition of Frances Harris*. M. B., Drapier, as a mask for the author, is psychologically less interesting than Gulliver, Bickerstaff, or the fuzzy-minded Robert Boyle of the *Meditation upon a Broomstick*. What form, then, has the common opinion of two centuries assumed the fourth letter to have, and for what virtues has the work been admired?

Critics have asked less often how far Swift as the Drapier wrote for posterity artistically than how far he wrote for posterity politically. He may be fairly exonerated from the charge of being by choice a Hibernian patriot. He took up the Irish cause, consonant with the practice of his entire career, as a defender of right and justice. Although Swift set forth a chart of Irish grievances primarily for the guidance of the Irish Parliament, as his seventh letter indicates, the fourth letter has spoken for two centuries to men who believe in freedom. He advanced several risky hypotheses (e.g., that Ireland was bound to England only by possession of the same king) partly to stabilize the Drapier's general position against the halfpence; partly for self-preservation, once he had advanced so far into the arena; and partly to exercise his playfully logical mind. These motives join with his humanistic sense of right as he expatiates upon the thesis that "all Government without the Consent of the Governed is the very Definition of Slavery" (p. 79). "If his Copper were Diamonds," the Drapier

had asked in the second letter, "and the Kingdom were intirely against it, would not That be sufficient to reject it?" (p. 26). The fourth letter has been read primarily as a clear, courageous blast against tyranny.

Politically Swift adheres to the Revolution Settlement and Locke: "In all free Nations, I take the proper Definition of Law to be the *Will of the Majority of those who have the Property in Land . . .*" (p. 164). Both in setting forth Protestant Ireland's grievances and in protesting his rights as an Englishman, he anticipates the American colonists. Even if unawares, he spoke as a Hibernian patriot. With the same lack of respect Shelley and Bryon felt for the Italians, he gave the savage Irish arms and ammunition: "by the Laws of GOD, of NATURE, of NATIONS, and of your own Country, you ARE and OUGHT to be as FREE a People as your Brethren in England" (p. 80). It must seem odd, to those accustomed to thinking of him as conservative rather than subversive and even radical, that Swift emphasized natural rights where Godwin, in company with Burke and Coleridge, emphasized traditional duties. The exiled Dean of St. Patrick's writes this letter as much to declare his love of liberty and his belief in the natural right of freedom as Milton wrote the *Areopagitica* to declare a similar faith. "I will transport myself into some foreign Land," declared the Drapier in his seventh letter, "and eat the *Bread of Poverty* among a *free People*" (p. 154). So nonsense Tennyson in the poem, "You ask me why, though ill at ease." But Swift remained at home and remonstrated against the chains about him instead of fleeing silently to a free people. If your reader be reasonable, he thought, you may appeal to his love of liberty.

This ideational roof over his argument arises less than anything else in the Drapier's letters from Swift's desire to move a variegated audience to diverse actions. The sense of right dominant here resembles the artistic sense by which Richardson killed off Clarissa Harlowe. Although Swift clearly attacked the halfpence as an actual, though willfully exaggerated, danger, and not merely as an excuse for fomenting a rebellious spirit among an abused people, his passion helps his wit give *A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland* a unity that could never have resulted from the informal refutation of topical pamphlets. With only nominal attention to the recent spokesmen for Wood, the Drapier expands his antecedent logic. Wherever they may be, Englishmen are protected from arbitrary acts of authority by their own written and common law as well as by unimpeachable universal laws. Therefore, the Irish may ignore English attempts at tyranny both safely and rightly. From here, in a lighter mood, like a farce following *Cato*, the work hastens to a kind of coda, which, like the scherzo that precedes it, is built of folk dances, Drapier-wise, on the torsos of William Wood and Robert Walpole, who must bear the brunt of Ireland's quarrel with the King's mistress. Only momentarily, by this reading, does the Lord Lieutenant, chief immediate

cause of the letter, interrupt the pattern traced by the play of Swift's mind.

III

This traditional interpretation of the letter's structure may be summarized thus: (1) introduction: a recapitulation or reminder of what has gone before; (2) ironic argumentation on main themes; (3) crescendo a triumphant declaration of rights; (4) scherzo of light irony; (5) coda: preposterous and personalized conclusion. Such a reading must regard half the sentences as needless excrescence. To understand the actual structure of the letter we must turn to the problem of what audience Swift has in mind as he answers some of the points raised by his various antagonists. For what readers has Swift chosen to answer these particular points? First, for "the Whole People of Ireland." Yet he would have none who read him forget that he is English in all but spot of birth. The English in Ireland, although mostly Whigs, he addresses as fellows. With the Drapier's first letter it became clear that, in general, "you" are the ragged Irish who, as Papists or illiterates, have a total incapacity for all preferment, "we" are the English colonists who have "almost an incapacity" for all preferment. Tacitly, and no doubt grudgingly, he admits the Dissenters, who hold a few seats in the Irish House of Commons. Actually, he makes no attempt to distinguish, on the basis of Irish versus English ancestry, among those who are, through the grace of God, communicants of the Church of England, but who were, through an inexplicable mystery of God's justice, born in Ireland. The "Declaration of the Grand Jury and the Rest of the Inhabitants of the Liberty of the Dean and Chapter of St. Patrick's, Dublin," presented to Swift on August 20, 1724, contains names like Bryan, Farrell, Hannigan, Magrath, Dempsy, and Kavanagh (p. xxxiv). Yet the Drapier explicitly divides the inhabitants into "*English Protestants*, who love their Brethren of that Kingdom," and "*Irish Papists*; who are as inconsiderable, in Point of Power, as the Women and Children" (p. 129). "Our own Dear Country" is Ireland, but "our Antient Kings" were English. Natives of Ireland seem to find it easier than others to understand how Swift could mean occasionally by "the Whole People of Ireland" only semi-franchised citizens of the English Pale, but the matter has not been fully examined.⁴

Actual statistics on the population are impossible to obtain, because Anglicans, other Protestants, and Catholics made counter-claims. Judging by returns on taxable residences, Anglicans made up about 15 per cent of the populace within the Pale—only 18 per cent in

⁴ See Richard Ashe King, *Swift in Ireland* (London and Dublin, 1895), pp. 1-11, 197-201; Daniel Corkery, "Ourselves and Dean Swift," *Studies* (Dublin), XXIII (1934), 203-18. The tendency recently has been to minimize Swift's concern for the native Irish; see Ricardo Quintana, *Swift: An Introduction* (London, 1955), pp. 21, 30, 124.

Dublin itself.⁶ The Drapier uses figures as if with care: the tinker Wood is attempting to ruin "a Million and a Half of People" (p. 26), but the Drapier's premise is "so manifest to the whole Kingdom" that he could "get it confirmed *under Five hundred thousand Hands*" (p. 82). The most recent authority has estimated the population of Ireland in 1725 as 3,042,000, although the Census Commissioners, with ultimate reference to the number of taxed hearths, had set the figure at 2,317,374.⁷ An abstract of 1736 estimated the ratio of Protestants to Catholics as 3 to 8: "105,501 *Protestant* families, and 281,401 *Popish* families."⁸ Sir William Petty, setting the figures in 1672 at 300,000 English and Scottish Protestants and 800,000 Irish Catholics, had written: "the British Protestants and Church have three-fourths of all the lands; five-sixths of all the housing; nine-tenths of all the housing in walled towns and places of strength, two-thirds of the foreign trade." Six of every eight Irishmen, he continued, lived in "a brutish, nasty condition, as in cabins. . . ."⁹ British economic control had not been reduced in 1725. Swift's estimate seems to have reduced the total population by about half, but his "Whole People" shrinks so often to become the Protestants within the Pale that they may be taken usually to be roughly his 500,000 signatories.

Privately, to Charles Ford, Swift wrote concerning the Drapier's first letter: "one can promise nothing from such Wretches as the Irish People."¹⁰ We may assume, then, that Swift desired (and received) the support of the beggarly Irish, but he did not stoop to counting them among brothers of his Drapier. "Is not their *Parliament*," he asks concerning "the People of Ireland" in the third letter, "as fair a *Representative* of the *People* as that of England?" (p. 40). The question of majority does not arise, because Catholics—like Communists haunting later minds—would overthrow the criterion of Reason necessary for the existence of representative government.

Despite addressing two different whole peoples of Ireland, Swift would seem to see little indication, as the Drapier pretends, that the whole people are likely to weaken. When he cites names and reversions in order to show why there are so few employments to be disposed of in Ireland, in paragraphs that the Drapier refers to as a digression (p. 74), he digresses in relation not to argument but to audience. He has been explaining to members of the Irish Parliament

⁶ *Two Centuries of Irish History, 1691-1870*, introduction by James Bryce (London, 1888), pp. 206, 394, 425, 475; John Angel, *General History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1781), I, 5, 63, 205, 209.

⁷ K. H. Connell, *Population of Ireland, 1750-1845* (Oxford, 1950), pp. 3-5.

⁸ *Abstract of the Number of Protestant and Popish Families* (Dublin, 1736), reprinted in *Collection of Tracts and Treatises . . . of Ireland* (Dublin, 1860-61), II, 536.

⁹ *Political Anatomy of Ireland* (edition of 1691), reprinted in *Collection of Tracts*, II, 19, 29.

¹⁰ *Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*, ed. David Nichol Smith (Oxford, 1935), p. 106.

and other possible place-seekers that the Whigs in England have no Irish offices to offer in return for betrayal of fellow sufferers in Ireland. In the "digression" he demonstrates for those already in office that the success of Wood's halfpence would destroy the income of their reversions no matter how corruptly they supported the Ministry or how completely they absented themselves from Ireland. "Money is neither Whig nor Tory." He has exposed this ace already in the third letter, addressed specifically to the nobility and gentry eligible for office, but he repeats it lest Lord Carteret be laden with a miscellaneous pack of bribes. Those whose wills Swift would bolster, who now "look upon themselves as Creatures at Mercy" come "fainting from the Field at the Point to Die" (p. 67), include English Whigs hopeful of office but virtually disabled by Irish birth from preferment in England. That Swift here trains one of his many eyes on those who will encounter the Lord Lieutenant in their official capacities is confirmed by *An Humble Address to both Houses of Parliament*, not published until 1735 but written soon after the fourth letter. This *Address*, usually called the seventh letter, expands the arguments of the fourth letter on the incompatibility of either office-holding or office-seeking, in Ireland, with support of Wood's halfpence.

Throughout the letter, of course, Swift chooses two-handed arguments and phrasing to subdue at once the fears of those who crouch behind the Drapier and the reasoning of those who favor the Government that props up Wood. Much of the skill we admire lies in the way Swift drives a mule train and, simultaneously, rides along a tightrope on a cycle with one wheel. If he sees the need to warn Irish Parliament, Privy Council, and assorted office-seekers against the imminent honey of Lord Carteret, he wishes at the same time to convince Lord Carteret that the nobility and gentry of Ireland will be adamant against all inducements. After acknowledging that the Whigs are sending the Lord Lieutenant as a threat, he has saved Carteret's name for dramatic introduction at this mid-point. He wishes to apprise those fellow countrymen who have political influence of the difference between Carteret and the impervious Duke of Grafton, lately recalled. He writes here, on the other hand, primarily for Carteret himself, whom he flatters not as the Drapier has previously flattered the King, possibly in order to safeguard his own hide, but because Swift wishes to assure Carteret of his personal good will and thus to heighten for Carteret the entire appeal to his reason.

Since April, Swift had been at great pains to determine as fully as possible the extent of his influence with his former friend. After ignoring Swift's first letter concerning the halfpence, Carteret had answered a second letter on June 20: "The principal affair you mention is under examination, and till that is over, I am not informed sufficiently to make any other judgement of the matter, than that which I am naturally led to make, by the general aversion which

appears to it in the whole nation."¹⁰ One of the most important *raisons d'être*s of the fourth letter is to demonstrate to Carteret, by the subsequent career of the published letter as well as by the letter's argument, the entire milieu into which he has arrived. Yet Swift must color the facts. On the theory that Carteret probably would not realize how easily Whigs in Ireland might respond to "good words, Burgundy, and closteting," how easily, in fact, they might be led against the Dean of St. Patrick's, the Drapier warns Carteret that bribery and suavity will be of no avail; minds are made up. As these are not "corrupt Times," the accomplished Lord Carteret will not have descended among the savage Irish "meerly to put an Hundred thousand Pounds into the Pocket of a *Sharper*, by the Ruin of a most Loyal Kingdom" (p. 72). Characteristically, Swift chooses language that may best produce the desired quite different effects on the respective partisans of the Drapier and of Wood. You, Lord Carteret, will not stoop to bribery in such a cause; you, Irish Whigs, should not embarrass yourselves by preparing for temptation from a man so honorable.

As Swift proceeds to the third and fourth sections of the letter, his thoughts turn more and more to the Whig Ministry in England. He attempts, not altogether incidentally, to get through the Ministry's censorship to "OUR FEW FRIENDS there," who "wonder at our Silence" (p. 84). These paragraphs, surely, were not germane to the immediate argument directed to the whole people of Ireland. To tradesmen, place-seekers, the Irish Parliament, Lord Carteret, the new Primate, and others "who come over hither to us from England" saying that "*Ireland is a Depending Kingdom*," he has addressed remarks because he hopes to influence directly the actions of each in regard to the halfpence. He expects little from the Ministry, but he wishes to demonstrate personally to them his victory over the patent. A moment for revenge upon the hated Whigs has come. The Drapier's constant pretense that he attacks and opposes only the vile impostor Wood ("Who are this Wretch's *advisers*?") now stretches thin as tissue.

Already, in the third letter, he had been impudent: "I am under some Doubt whether Eight hundred Pounds a Year to the Crown would be equivalent to the Ruin of a Kingdom" (p. 46). He had then concluded from the published logic of His Majesty "that the Recalling the Patent is not to be understood as a Thing *In his Power*" (p. 60). Our shopkeeper rises now, with his fourth letter, in almost naked insolence: he admits the King's power to assign patents, and the liberty of the patentee to offer them wherever he chooses, "only attended with one small Limitation, That *no body alive is obliged to take them*" (p. 70). The Drapier might well wonder "whether the *Penner* of those Words in his Majesties *Most Gracious Answer* . . . had maturely considered the several Circumstances, which, in my

¹⁰ *Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D. D.*, ed. F. Elrington Ball (London, 1912), III, 195. See *Letters to Ford*, pp. 109-12.

poor Opinion seem to make a Difference" (p. 71). Either the Ministers as well as the King are wholly ignorant of the papers written in the Irish defense, as he supposes is the case, or arguments attributed to them have been issued by charlatans as impudent as Wood himself (p. 81). And so on. Walpole, after making his first unmistakable appearance in the letter as "*Some body*," returns a few pages later as Mr. W—, who reportedly will "cram this Brass down our Throats" and either "make us swallow his Coyn in Fire-Balls" or "eat our Brogues" (p. 85). It is impossible, reasons the Drapier, that a "great Councillor, in high Trust with his Majesty," could know about these empty threats, for "This is not the Style of a Great Minister." Even here Swift apparently had in mind intimidation as well as ridicule. That he was not beyond extreme measures to influence particular readers is evident, if evidence be needed, from his "Seasonable Advice" to the grand jury soon to be faced with a bill against the Drapier's printer and his bracing assurance to the Irish Parliament that he believed them not only "the *Voice of the Nation*," but "in some Manner, the *Voice of God*" (p. 154).

He knew that this irony and his entire victory over Walpole would be appreciated by Arbuthnot, Pope, Gay, and others in England, that Bolingbroke would learn the details; for these, and for himself, as well as for friends in Ireland from Archbishop King to Patrick Delaney, he added flourishes and subtlety, such as the notation that the Irish had "never once offered to stir in the matter" (a clause certainly not written for Lord Carteret), an admission further along that understandings in Ireland "perhaps are none of the brightest," the jibes at lawyers and their precedents, the statement that Molyneux opposed English oppression "as far as Truth, Reason, and Justice are capable of opposing," and, returning to Walpole, that "as his *Integrity* is above all *Corruption*, so is his *Fortune* above all *Temptation*." Simultaneously, for those not yet angered by the Drapier's straw man Wood, associating the halfpence with Walpole calls up a hundred publicized corruptions.

IV

Swift's best satire, as Professor Quintana has shown, is situational.¹¹ He becomes a speaker or narrator experiencing or reporting an absurd situation entirely coherent in terms of its own logic. Nevertheless Swift is always besieged with practical and immediate aims along with literary aims, though seldom so overwhelmingly as in the Drapier's fourth letter. M. B., Drapier, had become a legal cloak rather than a literary guise. When Swift drops into the rapids of his irony two simple anecdotes about the Dutch method of reckoning and the condemned Scotchman who objected to the "cookery" of routine execution, he drops them less to exercise the creative enthusiasm of

¹¹ Ricardo Quintana, "Situational Satire: A Commentary on the Method of Swift," *UTQ*, XVII (1948), 130-36.

the first two letters than to recover the attention of the less solemn among his readers. Of his two brief fantasies, in the manner of the first letter, on the statistics of the devaluated brass farthing, the first falls slack (p. 74); it required the tempting withers of Walpole to evoke the creative glee of his earlier sallies. When determining the number of halfpence Walpole might cause to be swallowed in fireballs, one must consider "the Squeamishness of some Stomachs and the Peevishness of Young Children" (p. 86). Yet Swift obviously writes here, as always, partly to satisfy the boundless appetite of the artist inside. If it is largely accidental that a pamphlet addressed with many aims to a diverse but specific audience has survived as literature, it is an accident that could happen only to a supreme and experienced literary artist.

University of Wisconsin

RUSKIN'S QUEST FOR A THEORY OF IMAGINATION

By VAN AKIN BURD

Ruskin's plan to work out Turner's theory of beauty for the second volume of *Modern Painters* failed to materialize as quickly as he had hoped. His diary shows that he was at work on the second volume before the first had left the press in May, 1843.¹ By January of the following year he noted that he was getting less and less productive. "All confusion about my book," he wrote. "I am in one of those blue fits in which one would be glad to throw up everything one possesses to get peace and live quietly in Chamouni...."² But a trip to Chamouni that summer did not make his work progress, and in the fall he found that his days were passing monotonously.³ The slow progress on the book seems to have been due to Ruskin's gradual realization that his plans lacked a satisfactory psychology of the imagination. "And now can you tell me," he asked Henry Liddell in October, 1844, "of any works which it is necessary I should read on a subject which has given me great trouble—the essence and operation of the imagination as it is concerned with art? Who is the best metaphysician who has treated the subject generally...?"⁴ Liddell apparently sent him to Aristotle, for Ruskin was soon writing him of his interest in Aristotle's theory of contemplation.⁵ Still the Greeks did not enable Ruskin to complete his project, and in the spring of 1845 he decided to make a tour through Italy. The secret of Turner's pale colors and shadowy forms somehow had escaped him. Characteristically, Ruskin had to gain this insight through his own poetic experience with nature and art.

Through the letters that Ruskin wrote to his parents while he was abroad in 1845,⁶ this paper will trace the events of Ruskin's Italian journey by which he came to understand the powers of the artist's imagination in the perception of beauty. His theory of the imagination, as he worked it out for the second volume of *Modern Painters*, is admittedly Coleridgean. Like the earlier writer, Ruskin conceives the imagination as that force by which the mind seeks to unify and penetrate experience. What Ruskin calls the associative imagination,

¹ Diary entry dated May 1, 1843, cited in *Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn (London, 1903-12), III, xxxi. This edition of Ruskin hereafter will be referred to as *Works*.

² Ruskin's diary, Jan. 4, 1844, *Works*, IV, xxi.

³ Ruskin's diary, Oct. 20, 1844, *Works*, III, xli.

⁴ *Works*, III, 670.

⁵ *Works*, III, 674-76.

⁶ The letters were purchased by the Yale University Library from Sotheby's on July 24, 1930, and as yet are largely unpublished. For a general description of these letters, see C. B. Hogan, "The Yale Collection of the Manuscripts of John Ruskin," *Yale University Library Gazette*, XVI (1942), 61-69. The letters cited in this study will be referred to by date and place from which written whenever this information is available on the letters.

Coleridge had termed the esemplastic imagination, referring to the power of the mind to shape form from matter. What Ruskin calls the penetrative imagination, Coleridge had described as that action of mind which "dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to re-create." Again like Coleridge he distinguishes between imagination and fancy to contrast creative thought with the routine patterns of association. The fancy, according to both writers, can work by pattern, but never can create an original whole. This similarity between the two writers does not mean, however, that Ruskin's own discoveries played no part in the development of his theory of imagination. Ruskin seems to have had only indirect access to Coleridge's ideas through Leigh Hunt's essay, *Imagination and Fancy*, which Ruskin cites in *Modern Painters*.⁷ Hunt, for example, had described the fancy as the younger sister of imagination, without the latter's weight of thought and feeling. Yet Hunt's brief essay omits the important psychologic distinctions which give breadth and originality to Ruskin's treatment. If Ruskin's theory of imagination was in part an extension of Coleridge's ideas through Hunt, a reflection too of his Evangelical training and his reading of Plato and Aristotle, the most important element seems to have been Ruskin's insight into the nature of his own aesthetic experience. His letters indicate that he learned much of the power of the imagination during his Italian journey.

Cook and Wedderburn were the first to examine Ruskin's letters,⁸ but they took little from them to correct the impression which Ruskin gives of the tour in his autobiography. *Praeterita*, written in Ruskin's later years, reflects the whim and bias of the elderly writer of *Fors Clavigera*. The account given in *Praeterita* of Ruskin's feelings for Ilaria di Caretto's tomb, interrupted by a digression on his aunt's dog, is lively but not representative of Ruskin's seriousness as a young man in Lucca. The autobiography then presents Ruskin's experience before the sleeping Ilaria as further proof of a mystic insight which Ruskin thought he possessed. Steeped in that Wordsworthian distillation so characteristic of the elderly Ruskin's memories of his youth, the autobiography reports that Ruskin saw the Ilaria at once "under the same laws as the river wave, and the aspen branch . . . but treated with a modesty and severity which read the laws of nature by the light of virtue."⁹ *Praeterita*, moreover, gives to the young traveler a degree of religious tolerance that he did not have until later. The frescoes of the Campo Santo, he says, showed him as a young man the

⁷ *Works*, IV, 254.

⁸ Cook and Wedderburn, however, recognized the tour of 1845 as the decisive factor in the writing of the second volume of *Modern Painters*, and called it a turning point in Ruskin's career. *Works*, IV, xxiii-iv. Derrick Leon, *Ruskin, the Great Victorian* (London, 1949), pp. 91-98, follows *Praeterita* closely, including Ruskin's pathetic emphasis on his illness and the vicissitudes of his life at Macugnaga. Reginald Wilenski, *John Ruskin* (New York, 1933), p. 51, mentions no particular developments in Ruskin's mind during this period.

⁹ *Works*, XXXV, 349.

whole doctrine of Christianity as neither papal nor anti-papal. Then in the didactic fervor of a *Fors*, Ruskin takes time to outline what he called the "total meaning" of Christianity, an outline which reflects none of the religious doubts that troubled Ruskin's conscience during his youth.¹⁰ The projection of the older Ruskin's social philosophy on his youth is another aspect of *Praeterita's* bias. Writing in that spirit which he took from Carlyle, he asserts, for example, that the frescoes of the Campo Santo exhibit the values of the true patriarchal life.¹¹ *Praeterita* also shows the sentimentalism of that veil of pathos in which Ruskin liked to wrap his youth. While at Padua, he writes, he was struck down by a fever which persisted in varying degrees until he reached home. Somehow he made the trip across the Alps, suffering—so Ruskin diagnoses forty years later—from what might have been diphtheria. Thinking of the tears his parents would have shed if he had died, he relates that he offered prayers for two days and nights until the symptoms of the disease had passed.¹² The conclusion to Ruskin's account of his tour reminds the reader of the frankness with which he described his attacks of madness in *Fors*. He scarcely had reached home, he declared in *Praeterita*, before he had sunk back "into the faintness and darkness of the Under-World."¹³

Ruskin's letters to his parents correct *Praeterita's* account of the spirit of his Italian experiences as they reveal his concern for a psychology of the imagination. The experiences of 1845 were for Ruskin a pilgrimage of the soul, a seeking in himself for that quality of imagination by which the painter Turner had conceived form. The letters show first that Ruskin's insight into the imagination was gained not in an "Under-World" of poor health and mental depression but in that spirit of joy which was to become part of his aesthetic creed. "What a change there is in me since I was here last," he wrote his father (Mentone, April 23), as he contrasted his health on this tour with his health in 1841, "—then weak and weary and sick at heart and feeble in sight—now neither sun nor wind nor mountain are too much for me." At first it was difficult for him to feel all the possibilities of his new freedom on this first venture abroad without his parents. Only at Dover, his thoughts were still on things behind. Coming down from the castle, he was overcome by a wave of homesickness. "Walked down hill again," he wrote that evening (April 2), "very sad because I hadn't anybody to come home to tea to. . . . Emptied all the tea into the pot to banish care. . . ." But it was spring, the kind of spring that Turner would draw, and at Montreuil where he saw the fine sunlight on the street at early morning, he found himself surrounded by scenes that he wanted to draw,

¹⁰ *Works*, XXXV, 351-53.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 353.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 377.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

scenes whose beauty, he said (April 4), intoxicated him.

His sensitivity to natural form was marvelously acute. Arriving at Sens in the afternoon light just after a thundershower, he found the town wet with bright colors and sweet with spring smells rising out of the ground. Every tree on the avenue, he told his father (April 7/8), was "a new perfection—Turners and better than Turners at every step—never saw anything so wonderful—so finished and refined in vegetable form." At a height near Dole (April 10) was another Turner effect: the Jura in the distance, a hard rain to the south "and gradually—out of the black sweep of cloud which shadowed the whole plain—the mountain forms emerged northward—into the sun and blue sky—only veiled here and there with soft white remains of raincloud, and the further ranges vivid with snow." On an evening walk at Pistoja (May 28), Ruskin saw the fireflies flash like stars on the sea, the impression to the eye, he said, being as if one were walking on water. "I was not at the least prepared for their intense brilliancy . . . and it was very heavenly to see them floating over field beyond field under the shadowy vines." He dreaded the hackneyed, the picturesque. He could not look forward to his trip to Venice because he thought the city "so hackneyed and overdone that one thinks of it more with reference to art than to anything else . . ." (Verona, September 7). But these fears were soon overcome. Eleven o'clock on the first night at Venice he wrote to his father, for he was so filled with what he had seen that he was unable to get to sleep. Standing on the steps of his door overlooking the canal, he saw that the water was not flashing in the moonlight. "There is not even a star twinkling," so he noted (September 10), "—it is as still as if Venice were beneath the sea—but beautiful beyond all thought. . . ."

Life was now beautiful to him after the discouragements of the winter, and it was once again an adventure. Traveling one night in his carriage—an experience his father would never approve—Ruskin wrote (Nice, April 22) with boyish spirit that when he woke, he "thought it was morning, and I was just being pulled out of bed by somebody. The moon was shining gloriously in at the windows. . . . I looked out—rubbed my eyes again and again—the snow was five feet deep beside the carriage!!" It was a lonely scene, he said, and we can see that it touched all his powers of response. "We were in the middle of a vast elevated plain—which swept up on both sides to concave masses of undulating mountains defined against cold, starry sky. From there the snow had been drifted . . . by the winter winds, so that it lay in wild, fantastic streaks and zones—with the dark earth between them. . . ." Across the snow in the moonlight lay the shadows of a few shattered trees. Overhead the Italian sky was marked with long bars of white cloud under which Ruskin could see the gleam and flash of the illuminated edges of the distant Alps.

For once life was fun for a man whose pleasures had always been

limited. An early rising, breakfast, and off they went in a torrent of rain. "Rains tomcats and newfoundlands." How funny his servant George looked when he peered up under a rain spout only to have a deluge of water in his face! While the party was waiting at a stage stop late in the afternoon, Ruskin noted (Grenoble, April 18) the amused astonishment of the bystanders as they saw him sitting "on the front trunks and making a careful study of a group of plane trees" with his sketch book on the carriage roof for a desk. In Italy he did not know at times whether to give himself over to feelings or laughter. His description (May 10) of the difference in respect which a beggar and a dog tendered to a holy water font must come as a surprise to the reader of the carefully pruned Cook and Wedderburn edition. The letters show Ruskin's real feelings about Mrs. Jameson, whom he met in Venice where she was gathering information for one of her museum handbooks on pictures. Mrs. Jameson had some tact and cleverness, Ruskin confided to his father (September 28), but actually she knew "as much of art as the cat." Although he found her hard and somewhat affected, Ruskin nevertheless enjoyed her company for a few days. He passed to his father tidbits of gossip that he had heard about her—the lady's reluctance to admit her age or her weight, the latter becoming a problem for Ruskin on one occasion when the two were in a gondola. Life was so full right now, he wrote his mother (Grenoble, April 18), that he couldn't always be thinking of writing on his book.

But Ruskin's joy was at the same time marked by that high seriousness and moral consciousness which he was to describe as characteristics of the imaginative mind. Ruskin's tour, I have said, was a pilgrimage of the heart. It was not pictures he was seeking so much as an understanding of that release of joyous feeling which he could see in Turner and the Italian primitives. As the pilgrimage wore on, Ruskin's father became fearful that his son might succumb to the temptations of Italian vice. The suggestion touched the pilgrim's sensibilities. "I did not suppose you would be at all anxious respecting my conduct," he wrote in reply (Nyon, October 25), "for you know that I was exposed to no temptations—not going into society. I see not what wrong I could have done—unless of the very coarsest and most willful kind, which I was not likely to fall into. . . . I should think that art was indeed a miserable pursuit if all my love for it would not keep me from common vices. . . . I conceive that with all my powers, training, and opportunities of free enjoyment . . . any seeking of it from illicit sources would be a sort of second fall of man. . . ." There could be no palliative, Ruskin added, for the man who deserts the moral obligations of his devotion to this high calling.

One aspect of Ruskin's seriousness was his gradual development of the social consciousness noted by Cook and Wedderburn,¹⁴ which was to provide him with a new motive for insisting on the insepar-

¹⁴ *Works*, IV, xxxiv.

ability of art and life. Looking at the Luxor obelisk in Paris, Ruskin felt that its imperfections as a work of art could be paralleled with the same imperfection in French character. Like the obelisk there is something grand in the French people, he wrote his father (April 4), but at the same time there is "always the imperfection, the filthiness—the corner of ordure—the moment of vanity. . . ." As he traveled, he became increasingly aware of the social effects of poverty and vice. At Digne he saw that the people were not blackguards, "but kept down by the poverty of a sterile country with no commerce. You cannot conceive anything so comfortless as this aspect of things," he told his parents (April 20). But Ruskin found that the worst effects of a degrading life on human sensibilities were to be found in the Italian indifference to the works of art in their possession. The letters cited by Cook and Wedderburn¹⁸ are ample evidence of Ruskin's pain at having to witness daily the destruction or "restoration" of the old pictures and buildings in Italy.

His own artistic consciousness, Ruskin discovered, could not escape the ravaging effect of the human misery around him. He wrote his father (Parma, July 10) that he could not treat Italy as a dream. "All the romance of it is gone, and nothing that I see ever makes me forget that I am in the nineteenth century." How could the painter reconcile his delight in natural lines with the hideous sights that lay alongside these forms? Here was a thin child beautiful in the folds of his ragged chemise—a scene worth drawing, Ruskin thought—but the child was lying flat on the pavement, sleeping like a corpse—possibly from lack of food. How could the painter work torn between delight and pity for this scene? Because Ruskin could do little to alleviate these conditions, he came to suffer from the sense of detachment that often besets the sympathetic traveler who realizes his inability to identify himself with the people in a strange land. Ruskin's unhappiness was not due to any desire to escape the realities of existence, but to a realization that his own way of living had kept him out of the main stream of life. He knew that the life he led was far too comfortable and hence too hardening. "I see nothing of human life . . .," he wrote (July 10) in a letter well known through Cook and Wedderburn's citation.¹⁹ "I get into no scrapes, suffer no inconveniences, and am subject to no species of excitement except that arising from art, which I conceive to be too abstract in its nature to become productive of poetry, unless combined with experience of living passion." At Florence (June 26) he was beginning to see in the sketches which he was making from the great painters that somehow their deepest secrets were eluding him. "I have been discovering at every step new darknesses—about me—new incapacities in myself. I have been digging wells like Abraham's servants and I can't drink." In the cloisters he saw pictures of the

¹⁸ *Works*, IV, 38-41, and elsewhere.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. xxxiv.

prophets, but out in the sunshine he saw in their place "pale, effeminate, animal eyed, listless sensualists that have no thought, care. . . ." It was a dangerous development, Ruskin thought now, and he yearned for the mountains where he could regain his judgment. "I shall not recover the spring of mind until I get on a glacier. . .," he wrote (Milan, July 16), in anticipation of his mid-summer journey to the secluded Swiss village of Macugnaga near the foot of Mount Rosa.

Ruskin's feelings about the pictures he was seeing must be studied in reference to this growing realization of the many forces always ready to alloy the purity of the artist's perception. The shift during the summer of Ruskin's preferences from Fra Angelico to Tintoretto signified, I think, his gradual discovery of the imagination as a faculty marked by discipline as well as spontaneity. As Collingwood noted, Ruskin first delighted in the art treasures of Italy, and especially Fra Angelico, for the same qualities that he had found in Turner—their spontaneous expression of feeling for natural form. In Raphael's "Joseph" Ruskin observed (April 30) the same graceful attitude that he had seen in the villagers at Sestri who were celebrating May Day, dancing in circles with flowers on their heads, their arms about each other's necks. The soft lines of Fra Angelico's backgrounds were those of the countryside at Lucca where the vines "with their young leaves hang as if they were of thin beaten gold [and] the bright green of the young corn sets off the grey purple of the olive hills" (May 3). Ilaria's tomb was in every way perfect, the lines selected with inconceivable refinement of feeling. "The cast of the drapery, for severe natural simplicity and perfect grace, I never saw equalled, nor the fall of the hands. . . . There is no decoration nor work about it. . . . you may stand beside it leaning on the pillow, and watching the twilight fade off the sweet dead lips and arched eyes in their sealed close" (Lucca, May 6).

Beautiful records of pure form, these pictures were also, Ruskin observed, complete statements of all the force of life. Ruskin was doubtless beginning to see in Italian art what he was to call the power of the penetrative imagination. Looking at the carvings on the cathedral doors at Pisa (May 18), he found that life portrayed in the border of flowers and fruit was so realistic that it made his mouth water. A great olive branch seemed ready to be gathered, and the raised apples on the door looked ripe to be pulled into a basket. The vitality of great art was not always to be felt at once. The dancing girls in a painting by Simone Memmi do not come upon one at once, Ruskin wrote to his father (May 22). "The figures seem at first a little stiff—but gradually, as the figures in a tapestry animate themselves in lovely dreams, they grow into life as you look—until you can see the very waving of their hair. This is only the case with the highest art—it tells the tale with such slight touches that you must give your mind to it wholly before it speaks." The outpouring of mind in Uccello's frescoes made Ruskin feel (June 9) as if he had not come

to look at them, but as if they had come to speak to him.

The most vigorous painter, Ruskin thought during the first stages of his tour, was Fra Angelico, whose best work was marked by its spontaneity. Fra Angelico was an exceedingly unequal painter, partly, Ruskin believed (June 4), because of his habit of never retouching his first impulses so that they might be closest "to the will of God." But it was this spontaneity, the purity and intensity of his feelings, that placed him above all other painters. "First of all the whole background is solid with gold—so wrought with actual sculpture that he gets real light—not fictitious—but actual light to play wherever he wants. For instance in the angel's wing . . . every single ray of the feather being cut into the gold so that as you move, the light plays upon every plume just as on a dove's neck . . . and then wherever they are dark—a blow is given with a blunt gouge which causes a hollow circle of burnished gold that glitters like a star . . . the effect to me is most divine" (June 6/7). Looking at one of Fra Angelico's pictures of the Virgin, Ruskin said (June 9) that he was content to believe in her as shown here simply because Fra Angelico had said he should do so.

Although Ruskin's main business in going to Macugnaga in the Alps was to make some drawings for his new book, his letters show clearly that he also regarded this venture as an introspective experience, an opportunity to stabilize his ideas under the influence of a beneficent setting. Like Chamouni, Macugnaga was the kind of setting that gave tone to Ruskin's feelings. According to a contemporary traveler, the small village was so removed that the natural charm of the valley had not yet been harmed by infectious travelers.¹⁷ It was no wonder that Ruskin wrote his father (July 27) that he looked forward to the valley as "a kind of Rasselas place," a Happy Valley where he could think by himself. Writing to a friend soon after his arrival, he compared his way of life with that of the hermit St. Paul.¹⁸ He was at last, he told his mother (July 24), in his own country.

From the letters written at Macugnaga, one may conclude that the main problem which occupied Ruskin's mind in this lonely spot was the dilemma in which he found his ideas about the imagination. Fra Angelico had confirmed Ruskin's belief in the artist who could record spontaneously his understanding of form and color abstracted from any associational values. As he had shown in the first volume of *Modern Painters*, great art was marked by the spontaneity of the artist's feelings for abstract form. Ruskin was now finding, however, how difficult it was for the painter to maintain a mind that could be sensitive to these feelings. In himself, at least, he could sense a difference in his responses, a cooling of enthusiasm, almost an inability to separate abstract values from the values of association. Did this mean

¹⁷ James D. Forbes, *Travels through the Alps of Savoy and Other Parts of the Pennine Chain with Observations on the Phenomena of Glaciers* (Edinburgh, 1843), pp. 343-44.

¹⁸ Letter to Edward Clayton, Aug. 3, 1845, Macugnaga, *Works*, I, 499.

that he had been mistaken in his approach to the creative life, or did it mean simply that Ruskin himself was to be unable to share in this experience because of personal circumstance?

At times it had seemed to Ruskin that this falling off of spontaneity in his responses was a matter of maturity. He was thinking at Macugnaga that, like Wordsworth, he had traded the spontaneity of youth for a different kind of capacity. It was not mere apathy, he told his father (August 6), who evidently was worried about this development, but in part, at least, "a different direction of likings. Formerly I hated history—now I am always at Sismondi. I had not the slightest interest in political science, now I am studying the constitutions of Italy with great interest. . . ." His responses accordingly were tempered by a more informed judgment. His spontaneity was controlled. At Lucca he had written (May 10) of his new difficulties in composing poetry. "I don't know how it is, but I almost always see two sides of a thing at once. . . . I never get strongly excited without perceiving drawbacks and imperfections which somehow were lost sight of when one was younger."

At other times, Ruskin had viewed this change regretfully. He had written from Milan (July 16) that his mind had become so far developed that he believed he could now judge the greatest art and take pleasure in nothing that was second-rate; yet for this he had sacrificed the spontaneity of his childhood. "I do not wake in the morning with the feeling of delight in everything that I used to have, nor can I amuse myself with the pebbles on the sea beach or lake shore for hours together. I think much of the blessed imaginative power of childhood is gone from me—and nothing can pay for it." Writing from the inn at Macugnaga, Ruskin warned his father that during the past two years his mind might have developed into something more commonplace than it had been. He saw himself now, he wrote (August 6), as "a quiet truth loving, fishing, reasoning, moralizing temperament—with less passion and imagination" than he could wish.

Yet it was this sobriety that led Ruskin to see the harmful effect of association on the undisciplined mind. At Parma (July 10) he had caught himself looking with indifference at a lovely chain of the Apennines. "What the d—l is the matter with these hills, thought I, that I don't care for 'em a bit? And after thinking a little more, I found it was because they weren't Cumberland nor Scottish. . . ." He confessed that he found himself preferring Chamouni over Macugnaga because of his childhood associations with the former. Macugnaga, he told his father, was comparatively cold without these associations. The ties of childhood are strong, Ruskin pointed out (July 27), for "it is a period of entire trust, hope, and insouciance—approaching nearer to a state of perfect felicity than any other life." Home ties, too, could distort one's views. "This morning as I was walking under the dull grey clouds before breakfast—through the wet meadows about the brook, I caught myself wishing that these were the Dulwich

fields and I were going home to breakfast in the library with papa and mama" (Macugnaga, August 1). How hard it was to consider intrinsic beauty for its own sake!

Ruskin's realization that the painter must not allow himself to mistake the feelings of association for insight into beauty may be seen in his letter to Henry Acland, known through the Cook and Wedderburn citation.¹⁰ There is a certain beauty, Ruskin declared to Acland, with which association has nothing to do, "whose laws are visible in the whole of creation, and whose principles—nay, whose existence—are rendered uncertain in most men's minds, by their bad habit of treating this essential beauty, and the accidental beauty of association, as one and the same." If men give themselves over to the accidental values of association, so Ruskin argued from his own experience, they will be conscious themselves that their minds have become distorted.

Ruskin recognized, however, that some types of association were so constant in character that it was easy to mistake them for beauty itself. The melancholy of the minor keys in music, like the color black, seemed to be above the accidents of mere association. To a value like this, Ruskin attached the term expression rather than association. In his book, he planned to separate this expression from the investigation of beauty itself. "For there is a cheerful beauty, and a melancholy beauty," he wrote Acland. "It is that which is common to both, and which makes both beautiful, which is in reality to be investigated under the term beauty." The powers of expression and association were very great, he conceded, but the "beauty of form, legitimate, real beauty" was traceable to higher qualities than these.

From the stay at Macugnaga Ruskin seems to have regained that healthy harmony of spirit which best sustained his own capacities for the creative life. "I had got my head fearfully puzzled in Italy," he had written from the mountain village (July 29), "...and I was getting a little adrift from my own proper beat and forgetting nature in art—now... I see my way." When he went from Macugnaga to examine Turner's sketching grounds at Faido and elsewhere, he was concerned not so much with the problem of the first volume of *Modern Painters*—Turner's fidelity to nature—as the problems of the second volume, Turner's transformation of nature through the agency of the imagination. "I have found his subject, or the materials of it here," Ruskin wrote from Faido (August 15), "and I shall devote tomorrow to learning them and seeing how he has put them together. The stones, road, and bridge are all true—but the mountains compared with Turner's colossal conception look pigmy and poor. Nevertheless Turner has given their actual—not their apparent size..." At one place he noted (August 15/16) a stream spanned by three new bridges of wood which Turner had cut out, keeping only the remains of an old bridge that he wanted. It was wonderful, he said (August

¹⁰ *Works*, XXXVI, 58-60. The editors dated this letter 1845.

17), to see the way Turner had arranged to cut out things. "I never should have dreamed of taking such a subject. George didn't recognize it at first, and on showing him how it had been adapted—'Well, he is a cunning old gentleman to be sure—just like Mrs. Todgers—dodging among the tender pieces with a fork.'"

The imagination as a selective faculty and as an agency of transformation continued to occupy Ruskin's mind at Baveno. "I am quite convinced now," he wrote his father (August 21), "that nothing is to be done in landscape without continual alteration and adaptation, and that's just what I can't come [*sic*]. I am getting to be able to render what I see with tolerable accuracy but I can't arrange—what I alter I spoil." The painter J. D. Harding was traveling with him at the time, and Ruskin noted how Harding worked for impression, while he worked only for information. But the composition of Harding's impressions was wrong, so Ruskin thought (Baveno, August 26): "his sketches are always pretty because he balances their parts together, and considers them as pictures; mine are always ugly, for I consider my sketch only as a written note of certain *facts*..." Because he would not yield to the pretty, the desirable, Ruskin felt that he was "on a road that leads higher than his, but it is infernally steep, and one stumbles on it perpetually."

The full capacities of the imagination burst upon Ruskin at Venice when he came upon the pictures of the then little-known Tintoretto. Everything which Ruskin had learned through Turner and the experiences of this summer he now saw synthesized in this Venetian painter. He saw first the great penetrative vigor of the Venetian's imagination. The figure of the young girl in Tintoretto's "Presentation of the Young Madonna," her head crowned in soft light, was "made so naturally and so perfectly the centre of all, and its child simplicity and purity so preserved" that Ruskin declared he knew of no other representation of this subject "in which so much reality and sweetness of impression is obtained." Possessed of infinite vitality, Tintoretto's imagination had the capacity to animate whatever it touched. "The Last Judgment" was not an effort to portray any single emotion but was instead "the great *sensation* of re-awakened life."²⁰

So moving were the powers of Tintoretto's effects that Ruskin found that they evoked in him an empathic response, something of a muscular recoil. Harding, so Ruskin said (Venice, September 24), felt "crumbled up" before the huge canvases, and Ruskin had the feeling of being utterly crushed to the ground. Tintoretto was best in his largest pictures where Ruskin could feel the painter lash out like a leviathan. "And such a Resurrection as there is!" Ruskin exclaimed before this picture, and then giving himself over to feeling, "—the rocks of the Sepulchre cracked all to pieces and roaring down

²⁰ Ruskin's notebook of 1845, *Works*, IV, xxxvi. The editors do not include the date of the entry.

upon you, while the Christ soars forth into a torrent of angels, whirled up into heaven till you are lost ten times over."

Besides reflecting the highest kind of penetration and physical power, Tintoretto's imagination showed the moral character that controlled it. Ruskin told his father to put Tintoretto over Fra Angelico at the head of his list of religious painters. Although Tintoretto's "Last Judgment" represented a local scene, it was so conceived as to give moral meaning to a river in the middle distance. In his notebook Ruskin interpreted it as "the great river of God's wrath: bearing down with it heaps of human creatures... hastening in insane, ungovernable terror from the vague wild distance—to fall into its waters and be borne away."²¹ "The Massacre of the Innocents"—so vivid that Ruskin felt that he could hear the women shriek—showed the victims as a mass of desperation and agony, "nothing disgusting, nothing indecent... but the most fearful heap of human grief and madness and struggle that ever man's mind conceived" (September 25).

The composition of Tintoretto's pictures was disciplined by a wonderful unity of expression. Not only should Tintoretto head the list of religious painters, Ruskin declared, but he should come second only to Michelangelo in the "painters of intellect." The quiet thought of "The Crucifixion," for example, was suggested by an ass in the distance, feeding on palm leaves. The color in "The Last Judgment," at least, was quiet and grey, properly subordinated as a matter of feeling to the main design. The conception of the pictures, nevertheless, seemed to be spontaneous—"the fellow outlines you your figure with ten strokes, and colours it with as many more. I don't believe it took over ten minutes to invent and paint a whole length," Ruskin declared (September 24). "Away he goes, heaping host on host, multitudes that no man can number—never pausing, never repeating himself."

If all of his notes on Tintoretto's pictures were available, we might know more of the extent of Ruskin's interest in checking the fidelity of natural form in the painter. Only his comment on "The Last Judgment" reminds us that this remained as an essential part of Ruskin's concept of nature. Whereas other painters presented a series of groups typical of the final judgment, Tintoretto, so Ruskin believed,²² chose a local scene, a finite spot of earth, for his picture. This comment suggests that although Ruskin regarded the Venetian as a highly imaginative painter, he also saw him as an observer of the particular in nature. It was not surprising that Ruskin concluded that Turner must have "got more out of Tintoret's poultry yard than everybody else's put together." Ruskin declared (October 11) that whereas he usually was able to trace Turner only in nature, now he felt certain that Turner must have studied the Venetian with devotion.

²¹ *Works*, IV, xxxvii.

²² *Ibid.*, p. xxxvi.

From his Italian tour Ruskin had gained the needed insight and impulse to continue his work on *Modern Painters*. The years between 1843 and 1845 had been a static period in Ruskin's growth, as he had come to realize that his interpretation of Turner's art needed a theory of imagination. Now he had discovered from his own experiences the powers of the imagination as he was to describe them in his book. He had felt the spirit of joy that accompanies the artist's perception of beauty. Ruskin had seen life as an adventure after the discouragements of the winter. The beauty of the Italian landscape had touched him as a new discovery. The artist, so Ruskin realized, must preserve a mind receptive to the appeals of natural form. He must have a readiness for the aesthetic experience. He must be able to distinguish between the associational responses of the fancy and the perception of the imagination which Ruskin had recognized as disciplined intuition. He had found, moreover, that high seriousness and a moral consciousness were characteristics of imaginative vision. The development of a social consciousness as a reflection of his seriousness was ready to lead Ruskin to insist that the imaginative artist never separates art and life. The aesthetic experience, so he knew now, did not mean a detachment from the real problems of life. It meant instead a high capacity of such an artist as Tintoretto or Turner to identify himself with life through the agency of the creative imagination.

Fired with these discoveries, Ruskin believed that Tintoretto had led him to new fields, had consolidated his feelings on art. "I shall work differently after seeing him," he said (Venice, October 10). Now he was eager to return home to get at the business of organizing the materials for his book, and this time, he assured his father (Martigny, October 23), he would work more carefully so that he would make no more blunders. Not forgetting to include word (Venice, October 11) of some new wine glasses which he had purchased to use for Mr. Turner the next time he came to dinner, Ruskin asked his father (Beauvais, n.d.) to have the horses ready for him at London Bridge.

*State Teachers College
Cortland, New York*

REVIEWS

King Arthur Today: The Arthurian Legend in English and American Literature, 1901-1953. By NATHAN COMFORT STARR. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1954. Pp. xvii + 218. \$4.50, cloth; \$3.50, paper.

Professor Starr's main thesis is that the Arthurian legend continues with unabated vitality to provide story lore and inspiration to writers of all levels of sophistication. This thesis is fully borne out by his survey of the large body of twentieth-century English and American poetry, fiction, and drama using Arthurian characters and motifs. Careful attention is paid to the Arthurian writings of Thomas Hardy, John Masefield, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Arthur Machen, James Branch Cabell, Charles Williams, T. H. White, C. S. Lewis, and Christopher Fry; and many lesser authors are mentioned at least in passing.

Because of the thematic organization of the book, the comments on different works by the same writer are likely to be rather widely scattered. Thus, E. A. Robinson's *Merlin* is treated in Chapter II, "Old World Newly Doomed," but the discussion of the same poet's *Tristram* falls under "The Tragedy of Cornwall," some fifty pages beyond. The same is true of the three novels by T. H. White. Whereas *The Ill-Made Knight*, as a story about Lancelot and the ruin of the Round Table, belongs thematically with Robinson's *Merlin*, the excellent remarks about *The Sword in the Stone* and *The Witch in the Wood* are reserved for a much later chapter, "The Comedy of Camelot." The unity of Starr's analysis of several important figures, then, is not a little disturbed by this arrangement, and the reader quite often finds himself leafing back to earlier pages. At the same time, it seems probable that the author adopted such an organization, despite obvious disadvantages, because he wished to place emphasis on how modern writers have interpreted for their age the different segments of the Arthurian legend: the love of Tristram and Isolt, the early career of Arthur, and the achievement of the Holy Grail.

Several relatively recent works, as Starr shows, give to the Grail story an immediacy never before attempted in Arthurian adaptations. For example, Arthur Machen's short story, "The Great Return" (1915), marks the abandonment of the sentimental antiquarianism of the Victorians, for Machen's setting is a town in modern Wales. Here the Grail materializes and exerts a transcendent influence on the lives of men. Again, *War in Heaven* (1930), by Charles Williams, depicts in present-day terms the conflict swirling about the rediscovered Grail between the forces of hell and the serene spiritual strength of Archdeacon Davenant. On a far grander scale is C. S. Lewis' powerful fantasy, *That Hideous Strength* (1946). The agents of evil in this novel are not the rather tawdry practitioners of the black arts we find in Williams. Rather, although Starr does not sufficiently point up this difference, they are men filled with the pride of Lucifer who are bent on substituting for the world of nature a non-organic technocracy and for mankind an utterly godless and servile race, all head and no body. The source of the potency and the self-confidence of the conspirators is demonic—they have subjected themselves to the will of interplanetary "macrobes"—but their methods, especially their brain-washing techniques, are those of today's totalitarian states. Opposed to the gigantic plot are the few members of a new Grail company headed by a Cambridge philologist who is addressed as Mr. Fisher-King or sometimes as the Pendragon. The Grail itself does not appear, but with the aid of the "Atlantean" powers of Ambrosias

Merlinus, who comes to them from his grave, the little company saves Britain and the world. Clearly, the book is a tract for the post-World War II age, enriched by the author's characteristically lucid expression of his spiritual insights.

Cycles of the Arthurian complex other than the Grail story have also been extensively exploited. The tale of Tristram and Isolt has been retold in the plays of Arthur Simmons, Thomas Hardy, and John Masefield, and, of course, in the superb *Tristram* of E. A. Robinson. A number of novelists, particularly Warwick Deeping, Bernard Faraday, Edward P. Frankland, and Bishop and Brodeur, have sought to re-create, in one degree or another of historical probability, the primitive Arthur and his Romano-Celtic milieu. The less serious novelists are also treated. Starr touches on the dated cynicism of John Erskine, and he discusses competently the grave intentions which underlie T. H. White's three novels.

In his remarks about the Grail stories of Williams and others, Starr recognizes traces of the largely discredited ritualist or cultist theories of Waite and Jessie Weston, and elsewhere he notes that Robinson's *Tristram*, although based on Malory, reveals the influence of Wagner's opera (p. 74). He also ascribes some of the modern interest in the Tristram story to the appearance in 1900 of Bédier's adaptation of Thomas and Béroul (p. 16), and he makes occasional reference to works by Alfred Nutt, Roger S. Loomis, A. C. L. Brown, and a few other Arthurian scholars. Nevertheless, it may not be said that Starr provides convincing justification for his stated belief that "without question a good deal of the new creative inspiration can be attributed to the enormous vitality of Arthurian scholarship in the last fifty or seventy-five years" (Preface, p. xiv). For many readers, the interest and value of the book would have been enhanced by a more systematic effort to identify the versions of the legend and also the works of scholarship that have entered into or influenced the literature studied here. In his novel *That Hideous Strength*, C. S. Lewis, for example, reveals much more knowledge about the Grail and the matter of Arthur in general than he could have got from Malory's *Morte Darthur* and from the Grail theories of A. E. Waite. Again, it would be of more than passing interest had Starr chosen to speculate why certain portions of the medieval legend of Arthur have been largely ignored by modern writers.

Yet, one must remain grateful for the author's clear demonstration that the Arthurian legend is still a living part of our literary stock and for his often perceptive comments on those who have elected to use it.

ROBERT W. ACKERMAN

Stanford University

Complete Prose Works of John Milton. Vol. I: 1624-1642. Edited by DON M. WOLFE. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1953. Pp. xvi + 1073. \$12.50.

This splendid volume is the first fruit of a much needed work on Milton's prose. There has never before been an edition of these works that is so completely annotated as the present one. And Milton's prose needs annotation at least as much as his verse. His multifarious reading is likely to leave its traces in the most unexpected places.

The plan of the series of which this volume is the first is chronological. So here in the first volume we have the earliest samples of Milton's prose through *The Reason of Church Government*.

Much has been written about the relationship of Milton's verse to his prose. Mark Pattison's lament over the fact that Milton wrote so much prose and took so much time in doing it implies that Pattison thought that Milton might have written more and better verse. This is, of course, pure speculation. Milton had high ideals for the poet and has expressed them in a well-known passage in *The Reason of Church Government*. One necessary item in Milton's view of the training of the poet is an acquaintance with practical affairs. I should like to suggest that Milton's prose works may be regarded as a record of laboratory experience in his own training of himself.

One valuable by-product of a project like this is the presentation of a recognized text as a basis for a concordance of Milton's prose vocabulary. The present volume promises well for the rest of the series.

ALLEN R. BENHAM

University of Washington

Samuel Johnson's Parliamentary Reporting: Debates in the Senate of Lilliput.

By BENJAMIN BEARD HOOVER. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications, English Studies No. 7, 1953. Pp. xi + 227. \$2.50, cloth; \$1.75, paper.

Johnson's "Debates in the Senate of Lilliput," based upon the debates in Parliament from February 13, 1741, to February 25, 1743, are in bulk Johnson's longest work. They have been very little discussed, the principal treatment previously being the twelve-page essay by George Birkbeck Hill added as an appendix to the first volume of his edition of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*. Professor Hoover's monograph amplifies, documents, and qualifies Hill's material. It is concerned especially with three topics: the history of Parliamentary reporting before and after 1741; the extent to which Johnson's reports were faithful representations of the actual speeches delivered in Parliament; and the style and artistic intention of the "Debates."

Johnson's "Debates," Professor Hoover reveals, were far from being the first of the efforts to give the world a periodic account of the proceedings of the two Houses. And in the scheme of pretending that the debates had occurred in far-away Lilliput, a scheme adopted in order to circumvent a new legal prohibition on the publication of Parliamentary affairs, Johnson had a precedent—the debating club of young noblemen and gentlemen invented one month earlier by the *London Magazine*. Professor Hoover is less sure than G. B. Hill that Johnson was the sole inventor of the Lilliputian idea, but he agrees in attributing to him the clever "Appendix" with which the "Debates" were introduced, and he reprints it in his own Appendix. That the "Debates" were interesting to readers is indicated not only by the prime position usually given them in the monthly issues of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, but also by their immediate reappearance (anonymously still, but without the Lilliputian disguise) in two rival collections of "history" published in London, one of them issued also in Ireland. In 1787 the "Debates" were appended to Buckland's collected edition of Johnson's *Works*.

The most valuable and the most laborious part of Professor Hoover's book is the second section, in which he endeavors to find out how close to the actual Parliamentary debates Johnson's reports were. The material for this inquiry is seriously limited, consisting chiefly of Bishop Secker's expansion of his shorthand notes on the speeches he heard in the House of Lords. By a patient, minute

comparison of the accounts of Johnson, Secker, the *London Magazine*, and of a few fragments otherwise, Hoover is able to show that in at least some reports Johnson must have had detailed and extensive notes to work from, that he was often familiar with the previously printed reports in the *London Magazine*, that he invented excellent speeches for the "Whig Dogs," that he stressed the point of view of the people, and that he regularly wove the actual ideas of the individual speakers into a fabric in which large and universal moral considerations triumph over the particular political issue. The speeches are basically a set of moral essays, composed in a style which is shown to be close to that of the *Rambler* of ten years later.

Professor Hoover makes some progress in defending the "Debates" against the charge that they are all monotonously glazed in the same stately and abstract manner of expression. But if this substantial book leaves anything to be desired, it is perhaps a freer commentary on the climaxes and collapses of the elegant, polysyllabic, and cadenced style with which Walpole and the other politicians are endowed.

There are two matters that one might complain of. The list in Appendix 2 of debates "generally accepted as by Johnson" and another list of those "said to have been revised by Johnson" leave one in doubt. Who are Professor Hoover's authorities? It would have been helpful also if he had given full bibliographical identification of "Torbuck," "Timberland," and "Chandler," when in the Appendix he compiles lists of reprintings of the "Debates" in those works. As it is, the reader must search in the text for the titles and hope that he has picked the right edition. Fortunately one has the feeling that all the information he needs about the "Debates" Professor Hoover has assembled.

BENJAMIN BOYCE

Duke University

The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition. By M. H. ABRAMS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953. Pp. xiii + 406. \$7.50.

The quickest academic capital gains are made in these times by the intensive propagation of limited insights, and it is not every day that an American scholar sets out, as Professor Abrams has done, to master a bibliography running to perhaps a thousand separate works and to reduce this mass to a book enlightened throughout by dexterity of intellect, brisk scholarly *élan*, becoming modesty, and occasional wit. Though lapses are not altogether absent from *The Mirror and the Lamp*, it is essentially lucid, consecutive, and precise, virtues which must be attributed more to Professor Abrams' own instinctive standards than to the after-effects of his total immersion in Coleridge.

In Professor Abrams' opinion, the advance of critical theory in the nineteenth century consisted in the successful war of the lamp, as the "key metaphor" to denote artistic creativeness, against the metaphor of the mirror. As the story goes, neoclassicism was shackled to a crude caricature of Aristotle's theory of imitation. In reaction the romantics—and some of the more mellow Benthamites—invented the notion that the poem imitates or mirrors nothing, but is either (1) a "heterocosm," afloat by levitation above the actual world, contriving and enacting the ramifications of its own mysterious entelechy; or else (2) an emotive "outpouring" to be judged only by laws of emotional truth in whose light mundane considerations are an impertinence. Coleridge's elucidation of the first

of these notions through the analogy of vegetative growth gets high praise here. And among the spokesmen of the notion that poetry is concerned only with feeling and is therefore neither true nor false, Professor Abrams has uncovered one Alexander Smith, whose proto-Carnapian views (to coin an Abramsism) had been for a century forgotten, even in his native Banff.

As the story further relates, neoclassicism was enamored of Horace, Locke, and Newton, and occupied itself either with forthrightly denigrating poetry or defending it with such crudity that the defense was itself an embarrassment. In reaction the romantics and their utilitarian allies groped in the direction of the theory that the poet is comparable to God the Father; and although Coleridge could not quite achieve this view, thanks to his admiration for bishops, it did find expression among later enthusiasts, including even Mill, of all people.

Professor Abrams' interest in ideas is both taxonomic and ecological: he not only describes and gives names to ideas, but also considers the environment in which they arose. His concept of environment, however, excludes almost everything but prior ideas. This is a reasonable method for the special purpose of his study; after all one person cannot do everything. But it is not ultimately satisfying, since it abstracts critical activity both from its literary manifestations (the book is almost devoid of literary quotation or reference) and from the great contemporaneous all-embracing ferment in basic ideology, of which critical theory was really a subordinate part (the book has no index entry for the French Revolution). This narrowing of method gives a somewhat sprawling form to the work, since the scholar inclined to take verbalizations at face value will discover that the world teems with ideas, each a genuine idea, to be sure, and each interesting *qua* idea. Yet the narrowing also oversimplifies. Professor Abrams seems inclined by temperament toward extreme judiciousness (the opening pages of Chapter VIII, for example, are a very model of perspicacity). And even so, the romantic revolution in critical theory tends to emerge from his pages as something like this: before 1800 critics were mostly idiots, except as they blundered upon the germs of romantic theory; after 1800 came the revelation according to Schelling, the Schlegels, and Coleridge. This is not the place to pursue this tangled question. As for the stupidity of Lord Kames and Thomas Sprat, however, it may be suggested that the discovery of the absurd is the beginning and not the end of the task for the historian of ideas. And as for the absolute value of Coleridge's aesthetics, despite the brave and ingenious championship of I. A. Richards, whom Professor Abrams admires, it may be recalled that modern Shakespearean criticism suffered almost total paralysis until it abandoned Coleridge forty years ago. I mention these predilections of Professor Abrams not with a view to providing a simple tag by which his work may be labeled, a lazy habit which he scrupulously avoids himself, but because it is important to be especially circumspect about a book whose merits seem to assure that it will be a standard college reference for a generation to come.

MALCOLM BROWN

University of Washington

L'Évolution de Walt Whitman: Après la première édition des Feuilles d'Herbe.
By ROGER ASSELINEAU. Paris: Didier, 1954. Pp. 567.

In developing this comprehensive study Roger Asselineau had before him the brilliant example of his compatriot Jean Catel, whose *Walt Whitman: La Naissance du poète* (1929) was chiefly concerned, as the title indicates, with Whit-

man's formative years. A major purpose of the present book has been to complete and fulfill the earlier work, and it succeeds so well that the two volumes are in a real sense complementary. Yet *L'Évolution de Walt Whitman* is by far the more formidable study in its thoroughness and documentation.

It is concerned with the whole range of Whitman's personal history and the history of his book through the thirty-seven years between the appearance of the first edition of *Leaves of Grass* and the death of the poet; and accordingly the study is exactly divided with neat balance into two parts—"La Création d'une personnalité" and "La Création d'une œuvre." Such a division possesses an obvious advantage in distinguishing two approaches and probably was on the whole a wise decision. Yet it also possesses a sharp disadvantage in separating what his book demonstrates—indeed, it is its very point—as one thing: the growth of the poet and the growth of the *Leaves*. In other words the great contribution of Asselineau's study is his careful and patient exposition of the nine editions of *Leaves of Grass* from 1855 to 1892 as a record of change, development, concealment, and confession in the poetic text and as a record also of pressures in the poet's life.

This approach—the study of the text as intimately related to the poet's life—had also been employed by Gay W. Allen in his *Walt Whitman Handbook* (1946) and by Frederik Schyberg in his *Walt Whitman* (1933, 1951) but not as completely as in this book. (Allen's *The Solitary Singer*, independently supporting this interpretation, appeared later.) Asselineau effectively puts to rest the untenable theory, once popular, that Whitman had a plan in his head from the start, a kind of blueprint whose directions he followed on schedule until at the close of life he could show the finished structure. He gives us a much more plausible theory in its place: that the poet, gifted with great expressive power and also deeply troubled by anomalous elements in his sexual temperament, managed to create with candor and courage a great work of art which was also a great ethical achievement, setting forth an ethical ideal inspiring to the reader and vital to the poise and health of its author.

The two-part division of this book is bound to suffer from some repetition of subject matter, but on the whole the author successfully avoids this difficulty. The biographical section is especially full in annotation, and in such factual matters as the press reception of the various editions of *Leaves of Grass* employs more detail than any earlier study of Whitman. During his three years in this country Asselineau examined most of the manuscript resources available—with some exceptions, such as the Feinberg collection—and his interpretation is exhaustively documented. There are a few printer's errors—among them, p. 518, n. 64, the inexplicable substitution of "By Blue Ontario's Shore" for "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking"—but the text is dependably accurate with all its wealth of reference.

The chapters of the second section are somewhat unequal in quality, and those entitled "L'Amérique," "La Démocratie," and "Démocratie et racisme" have perhaps more freshness for the foreign reader than the American. The most rewarding are "Le Mysticisme et la poésie du corps" and "L'Esthétique fondamentale," in the first of which Asselineau gives eloquent recognition to Whitman's faith in the body's joy as the source and condition of mystical revelation; and in the second quite as eloquently enforces the truth that Whitman's aesthetics are inseparable from his ethics—a timely reminder now that Whitman's aesthetic aspect, as against earlier neglect, is being emphasized in recent criticism.

The book ends on a somewhat muted note, suggesting that tragic elements in Whitman's history necessarily prevented his full twofold success—immortal

poetry and a noble life. This is probably true. Yet what other poet has better evoked joy and courage? The final note in Whitman is affirmation.

HAROLD BLODGETT

Union College

Scottish Poetry: A Critical Survey. Edited by JAMES KINSLEY. London: Cassell and Company, Ltd., 1955. Pp. ix + 330. 30s.

In our Ph.D. factories Scottish literature is usually treated like a poor relation. It may receive a perfunctory kind word or two in passing, but is seldom listened to seriously. No candidate would dare face his orals without having scaled those Everest of dullness, *Euphues* and the *Arcadia*, but he would have a good chance of getting by without knowing Gavin Douglas, Robert Henryson, or even Burns. Among any average group of American Doctors, probably half would glibly label Burns a pre-Romantic, and at least as many would mispronounce such names as Moray, Dunbar, and Home.

The Scots themselves are not blameless for this neglect of their literature. Their public attitude toward it has varied from apology to aggressive chauvinism, but too often they have left basic jobs of research to be done by Englishmen and Americans. The tendency is not extinct. In the present volume, Douglas Young, lecturer in literature at the University of St. Andrews, mentions the need for reappraisal of the work of John Davidson. "Perhaps," he blandly adds, "an American university will finance an accurate and complete collected works." But it would be grossly unfair to treat that remark as typical of the book.

On the contrary, the volume represents interpretive scholarship at its ripest and best. Each of the ten main chapters is from the hand of a specialist. James Kinsley, the general editor, writes of the medieval makars. The late Agnes Mure Mackenzie discusses the Renaissance poets who wrote in English or Scots, and James W. L. Adams those who used Latin. Sir James Fergusson, Keeper of the Records of Scotland, has a fine chapter on the ballads. Mrs. A. M. Oliver, David Daiches, and Robert Dewar discuss, respectively, the Scottish Augustans, the vernacular poetry of the eighteenth century, and Burns and the Burns tradition. John W. Oliver handles the poets of the earlier nineteenth century; Douglas Young those of the later (with a note on modern Gaelic poetry); and George Kitchin deals with recent and contemporary figures.

Among work which is always competent, and frequently distinguished, it is almost invidious to single out chapters for special praise. Two, however, are outstanding: Miss Mackenzie's and Sir James Fergusson's, the one for its clarity, the other for its freshness. To say something new in brief compass on the ballads—the one Scottish subject, by the way, which is usually handled adequately in American graduate schools—is far from easy. Sir James does it by drawing upon the legal records of the kingdom for evidence of the close parallels between the diction of the ballads and the contemporary prose speech of Scotland.

The whole book might serve as a model to graduate thesis writers, in that it proves the possibility of combining erudition with grace of expression. These scholars are not afraid to be colloquial. Note Miss Mackenzie's summation of David Lindsay's *Monarchie*, to tackle which now, she says, "needs firm resolution and strong black coffee": "It is, in fact, the close equivalent of *The Outline of History* by the late H. G. Wells, and frankly intended for 'Colyearis, Cairtairis and Cukis, for Iok and Thome'... learning-made-easy, with a view of the Heid Yins that adds moral to intellectual self-satisfaction, an infallible recipe for the

best-seller." Macpherson's Ossian, too, has never been hit off more neatly than in Mrs. Oliver's comment that "never, one feels, has so much excitement been roused, in so many, by such fustian."

In short, this is no mere cram-book; it is a work to be read with pleasure for both style and subject matter. But it has value also for doctoral candidates—and their examiners. There is less excuse than ever for neglecting the riches of the Scottish poetic heritage when this one volume will supply an examiner with all the searching questions he will need to ask in the orals.

DELANCEY FERGUSON

Brooklyn College

Njáls Saga. Translated from the Old Icelandic with Introduction and Notes by CARL F. BAYERSCHMIDT and LEE M. HOLLANDER. New York: New York University Press for the American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1955. Pp. xii + 390.

The new English version of *Njáls saga* by Professors Bayerschmidt and Hollander belongs on the shelves of every library which aspires to a collection of the classics of world literature. The translation is thoroughly reliable and is in colloquial, idiomatic English that is comparable to the Icelandic original.

This translation represents the most ambitious contribution yet made in the effort to provide the English-speaking world with a new corpus of translations from the Old Icelandic which will supplant the older versions of Morris, *et al.*, with their archaisms and stilted language. Dasent's translation of *Njála* played a noteworthy role in awakening interest in medieval Icelandic literature in many inquiring minds and it has its place in literary history, but it must now be viewed as superseded. The following example of extreme contrast speaks for itself:

Dasent, ch. 118: "then thou shavest thy poll, and puttest pitch on thy head, and then thou hiredst thralls to cut up a sod of turf, and thou creptest underneath it to spend the night. After that thou wentest to Thorolf Lopt's son of Eyra, and he took thee on board, and bore thee out here in his meal sacks."

Bayerschmidt-Hollander, ch. 119: "Then you shaved your head and smeared it with tar. Then you paid some slaves to cut a strip of sod for you to creep under at night. Then you fled to Thórólf Loptsson of Eyra, and he took you in and carried you aboard his ship in flour sacks."

That Dasent's version is nevertheless in part stylistically superior to the Bayerschmidt-Hollander betrays the novelist in Dasent; Bayerschmidt and Hollander more accurately reproduce the saga, whose author or authors were not concerned with uniformity of sentence structure and style.

Like Dasent, Bayerschmidt and Hollander have on the whole endeavored to replace Icelandic idioms with English idioms rather than to translate literally, but their translations differ from Dasent's. For example, the phrase *en þat mun þó síðar reynast*, which Dasent renders "But that will be put to the proof by and by," they translate as "but we shall see what we shall see." Or *morgir kjósa eigi orð á sik*, which in Dasent's version was "Listeners do not often hear good of themselves," is in the new translation, "You can't prevent people from talking ill about you."

The treatment of names, ever a knotty problem, has been resolved according to the principles set down by Professor Hollander in a significant recent article ("The Problem of the Proper Translation of Old Norse Names," *Scandinavian Studies*, XXVI [1954], 125-29). The result is satisfactory although it incorporates willful inconsistencies and redundancies. Some place names are left unchanged, e.g., *Grjóta*, while others are translated, e.g. White River, for *Hvítá*.

On page 35 the reader meets Medalfell Strand but Broad Firth (*Meðalfells-
strönd*, *Breiðafjörðr*). On page 211 *Berufjörðr* is translated as Bear Firth, but
Berunes(s) is untranslated. In this last case, one wonders whether the reader
will make the connection between the firth and the ness. Occasionally Bayer-
schmidt and Hollander have felt called upon to provide both the place name and
its translation. Gunnarsholt is followed by "Gunnar's Wood" in parentheses
(p. 53); Landeyjar is followed by "Landisles" in brackets (p. 54). Occasionally
the treatment of place names is indefensibly arbitrary, as, for example, when
Bláskógaheiðr becomes Black Forest Heath (certainly a misleading name for the
Icelandic landscape!) whereas *Öxarhraun* remains unchanged. The men from
Möðruvellir are the "men from Modruvellir," whereas the *Vatnsfrðingar* are the
"men from Water Firth." Noteworthy is the rendering of *Kirkjubær* as "Kirkby"
(p. 108), which is a loan word and translation in one. Incidentally, the translators
have taken pains to preserve the sign of length over vowels but have treated the
umlaut in cavalier fashion. Cf. *Fiskivotn* but *Öxarhraun*; *Bjorn* but *Gudröd*.
Cognomens have also been treated inconsistently. On page 126, for example, we
read of Starkad "son of Bork, surnamed Blátannarskegg, who was the son of
Thorkel, surnamed Boundfoot," and on page 123 we find "Thormóð Skapti, the
son of Óleif the Broad, the son of Ólvir Barnakarl." Whatever one may think
of the lack of consistency in the treatment of names, it must be admitted that in
the Bayerschmidt-Hollander version of the saga they are always recognizable.

Here and there a few phrases have been added where needed to explain the
sense of a sentence. Sometimes the added phrase appears in parentheses (as on
pp. 76-77), sometimes in brackets (e.g., p. 85), but elsewhere there is no indica-
tion of the augmentation (e.g., in the sentence "Now it must be told that Atli
one day in the absence of the men asked Bergthóra . . .," for *Nú er at taka til
heima, at Atli spurði Bergþóru*, p. 85). The use of parentheses or brackets to
indicate such additions seems rather pedantic. The additions, if necessary and
clearly defensible, are an integral part of the translation and do not need the
apology of parentheses.

Only two phrases of any significance have been omitted in the translation: *Sem
móðir mín vili*, page 23, line 18, and *þar var kominn Starkaðr ok synir hans, Egill
ok hans synir* on page 129, line 3 from the bottom.

The use of the Icelandic terms *fylgjur* on page 31, *goði*, page 34 and *buna* on
page 59, and *disir* on page 201 will cause readers to stumble. Here footnotes
might well have been inserted. The phrase "challenge to the holm," pages 34
and 62, should have been explained. Perhaps the second printing of the new
translation can take care of these trivial matters.

The introduction, by Professor Hollander, will put the reader unfamiliar with
the style of the sagas in the correct frame of mind to appreciate Njála. The notes
at the back of the book, while in themselves commendable, could easily have been
expanded.

Now let us have an equally good version of *Egils saga*.

P. M. MITCHELL

University of Kansas

Rasser of Alsace. By L. A. TRIEBEL. London and New York: Cambridge Uni-
versity Press; first printed and bound in Australia by Melbourne University
Press, 1954. Pp. ix + 150. \$5.50.

Johann Rasser, Alsatian clergyman and dramatist of the late sixteenth century,
has long attracted the attention of scholars particularly because of the interesting

illustrations to one of his two dramas, the *Spil von Kinderzucht*. These illustrations, obviously drawn from actual performance, seem to afford important material for the reconstruction of the German stage of the time. Yet they are ambiguous enough to allow rather contradictory interpretations and have evoked heated polemics. These illustrations, no doubt, induced L. A. Triebel to write the study now under review.

The book begins with a short sketch of Rasser's life. This sketch contains hardly any new material; rather, it is a handy recapitulation of previous research some of which is inaccessible to the ordinary reader. The chapters that follow ("Historical and Social Background," "Rasser's Aim as School Dramatist," "The Basle Play Book of *Spil von Kinderzucht*," and "Boy Actors in the Sixteenth Century") are more summaries of work done by others than original research. It is regrettable, moreover, that the author relies all too heavily on the work of English scholars and general histories of literature and of the drama and to some extent neglects individual studies of the particular field. A number of misrepresentations are the consequence of this procedure.

It is incorrect, for example, to say: "The use of dialogue, like Erasmus' *Colloquies*, led to the acting of Plautus, Terence and Seneca, as well as the humanist, neo-Latin and vernacular playwrights" (p. 18). Locher's, Reuchlin's, Grünpeck's dramas, the first neo-Latin plays performed in Germany, preceded the great vogue of the dramatized dialogue and were clearly inspired by Italian humanistic performances.

It is completely wrong to speak, as Triebel does, of the "common humanistic procedure of memorizing meaningless forms and rules in an unknown tongue..." (p. 27). On the contrary, the humanists criticized the conservative universities, dominated by Scholasticism, for this pedantic method and instituted their drama partly to overcome this old-fashioned way of teaching. Rasser need not have taken the concept of the comedy as a mirror of human life from the Protestant Sturm (p. 32, A 8). We find this idea over and over again in humanistic writing: it is of course derived from antiquity.

Triebel mentions "a mingling of morality and interlude" (p. 41) in England, France, and Germany and a little later speaks of the rarity of the morality in Germany. Actually, with one or two exceptions, there were no morality plays in Germany. The Lübeck *Fastnachtsspiele* that Triebel mentions are known to us only by title; I doubt that they had the character of morality plays.

Pages and pages (45 ff.) are devoted to a survey of the English drama and stage without contributing anything new or making any clear reference to Rasser's work. On the other hand, with the exception of Wimpfeling's *Stylpho*, Rasser's German humanistic forerunners in the field of *Kinderzuchtspiele*, such as Grünpeck, Bebel, Hegendorffinus, and others, are completely omitted.

Finally, in the last two chapters we are introduced to Rasser's play. Chapter VI gives the plot and characters with occasional comparisons to other plays. Triebel rightly criticizes former scholars for overstressing the didactic element in the drama of the time. On page 107 we find the one-sided statement: "Reformation preceded Renaissance in Germany." As if Celtis, Reuchlin, the *epistolae obscurorum virorum* did not exist!

The most important chapter of the book, however, is the final one on staging. Here Triebel is the first to compare the illustrations with the text and, primarily, with the stage directions of the play. Yet the result is not particularly revolutionary. Triebel's *Bühnenbild* is something of a compromise between the various more radical reconstructions of former scholars. By and large, Rasser's stage seems to have derived from the successive staging of the earlier humanists,

although some influence of the simultaneous staging of the medieval drama can still be detected. Triebel rightly stresses that most if not all of the play consists of outdoor scenes; he points to the fact that even the *Rath* of the king shows some outdoor character; the stage direction reads: "Nach dem Thobias aus dem Rath gangen / stund der könig auff und gieng in sein Losament" (130).

I noted only one misprint (repetition of the word "and," p. 34). But I cannot accept the one emendation Triebel undertakes (p. 32, A 9) *ermelter Jugend*—the "above-mentioned" youth sounds much more likely than *erwelter Jugend*; the participating students were obviously not a selected group.

The book as a whole seems to contribute little to a more thorough understanding of the German stage in the sixteenth century and nothing at all to a better knowledge of the literature of the period.

WOLFGANG F. MICHAEL

University of Texas

Novalis: German Poet—European Thinker—Christian Mystic. By FREDERICK HIEBEL. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, No. 10, 1954. Pp. 126. \$3.50, paper; \$4.50, cloth.

Professor Hiebel's book is a condensed version of his larger *Novalis, der Dichter der blauen Blume* (Berne, 1951); it is intended primarily for the "general reader" possessed of little or no German. The book opens with an introduction which excellently places Novalis against the background of the age of Goethe, and proceeds to a brief biographical sketch; here the account of Novalis' friendship with Friedrich Schlegel is particularly interesting.

Very properly, more than two-thirds of Hiebel's study is devoted to an interpretation of the works themselves. It soon becomes apparent that Hiebel considers Novalis not only a great poet but one of the supreme poets and thinkers of all time. This at least is the impression given by the comparisons drawn between Hardenberg and Dante, Goethe, and even (p. 114) Plato. Possibly a more restrained estimate would have been better tactics as well as better criticism.

The interpretation of "Eros und Fabel" is one of the high points of the book. In dealing with the "Hymnen an die Nacht," as elsewhere, Hiebel seems to play down Novalis' startlingly vivid sexual imagery; he veils somewhat the daring juxtapositions of the poetry. Too little space is given the topic of "magic idealism" to give the reader a clear impression, but the analysis of the structure of *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* is very helpful.

The style is clear, if at times a bit exclamatory. There are a few Germanisms and occasional slips like references to the *Xeniae* and to "courtly absolution" [absolutism]. The book is marked by warm enthusiasm and gives evidence of close and devoted study of Novalis.

HENRY HATFIELD

Harvard University

Herman Heijermans and His Dramas. By SEYMOUR L. FLAXMAN. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1954. Pp. viii + 266. 14.50 guilders.

Dr. Flaxman here presents an extended study of Herman Heijermans (1864-1924), whom he designates as Holland's "greatest modern playwright" (p. 63) who, "for the first time in two hundred and fifty years, achieved a real popularity at home and abroad" (p. 9). Heijermans' plays were extensively translated and

were produced in several foreign countries, including England, France, Germany, and the United States. Flaxman's work is "an attempt to give a biographical sketch" of Heijermans and "to review his entire dramatic work against the background of his own life and the European drama of his day" (p. 14). In a thirteen-page introduction the author undertakes to identify the larger European literary setting and the main literary and social currents by which Heijermans was influenced. Even as supplemented by a final chapter on the influence of Ibsen and Hauptmann, this analysis is somewhat too brief to be adequate. In the biographical sketch, the author identifies the more immediate setting, the domestic and social compulsions of Heijermans' personal life, and the struggles and conflicts of his varied professional career as journalist, playwright, producer, manager, novelist, and incidental social reformer.

It is Heijermans' broadly critical attitude toward the mores of bourgeois society rather than a more specifically aesthetic criterion that the author employs as the principal basis of classification of the dramatist's numerous works. Four chapters are devoted to groups of plays which are critical, respectively, of religious conservatism and intolerance, exploitation of labor, middle-class morality in the realm of marriage and the family, and the love of money. A fifth chapter is concerned with the dramatist's fantasies and satires.

Heijermans was a socialist, though not a consistent party-man. He felt that society, because of its artificial and insensitive standards and narrow orthodoxies, is to blame for most of the personal tragedies and group indignities which men must endure. The author gives a careful and detailed analysis of the particular variants of this theme as embodied in the social dramas. In the course of this analysis, he shows how Heijermans, in his treatment of these themes, gradually escaped from his early tendency to didacticism and in his literary maturity revealed a self-sustaining literary power. In contrast with the social dramas, which show the influence of French naturalism, the fantasies and satires exhibit a different aspect of his creative imagination, in the products of which Flaxman discovers the influence of French symbolism. He is careful to point out, however, that any classification of Heijermans' plays is difficult because of the mixture of literary and social attitudes which they reveal. The assignment of standard labels indicating literary schools and aesthetic philosophies is equally difficult, and for the same reason.

Even if this is granted, there remains the impression that the author has not adequately followed through on his own criticism. For example, several times he makes the important general criticism that Heijermans, because of his great power of invention, did not have the sustained control of his materials which is essential to expert dramatic craftsmanship; more specifically, that several of his long dramatic works, including some of the most important, are not well constructed. (This judgment is indirectly supported by the opinion of other critics that Heijermans' one-act plays are his most successful productions.) But in these cases the author fails to identify the particular structural weakness which he undoubtedly has in mind. This leaves the reader in no position to compare the author's critical opinions with his own or with those of other critics. What seems to this reviewer to be a general weakness of this study is the paucity of specific analyses and criticisms of the dramas considered as literary productions of a particular form, that is, as dramas.

What the reader will find in abundance are detailed analyses of the plots of almost every one of Heijermans' dramatic works. There are numerous cross-references from one play to another, particularly in respect to similarities and differences between characters. Because of these characteristics, the book will

prove very useful as a compendium of factual information about Heijermans' plays.

Judgments on the value of the book as a work in the field of literary criticism will doubtless differ. If the reader thinks with Santayana that literary criticism should be an expression of the philosophy of the critic, he may be somewhat disappointed. He will doubtless find the study too reportorial for his taste. Those who are familiar with the complexity of Heijermans' artistic personality and the variety of his output will readily agree that the organization of the study and the evaluation of the plays in terms of specific aesthetic criteria would have been a most difficult task. They will nevertheless feel that the work would have been more useful to literary scholars if the author's treatment of his subject had been more "professional." He makes clear enough what each play is about and what part each character plays in the plot. What is lacking is sufficient critical analysis of aesthetic qualities. It would have been helpful to the student of the drama if, in the case of at least some of the more important plays, the author had analyzed in detail the technical form of the play and judged it with respect to its adequacy as a dramatic vehicle of the subject matter.

Although it is in some respects more than that, this book might be generally characterized as a useful introduction to a critical reading and study of the works of the great Dutch dramatist for those who know little or nothing about him. It cannot be denied that this characterization is likely to fit most prospective American readers. Because of the language barrier and the lack of interest of American publishers in translations of Dutch literature, this type of study may, for the time being, be the most useful approach to the development of literary understanding and appreciation of Dutch literature in the United States. It may help to uproot an assumption which is all too general in this country, namely, that because a country is small, its literature is of minor importance. Those who are interested in seeing this notion dispelled will warmly welcome the book and commend the author for his initiative. They will also recognize the foresight of the Netherlands government in encouraging Mr. Flaxman in his undertaking.

MARTEN TEN HOOR

University of Alabama

Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß. Edited by WOLFGANG STAMMLER. 19. Lieferung, II. Teil: *Geschichte des deutschen Romans vom Biedermeier bis zur Gegenwart.* By RUDOLF MAJUT. Berlin/Bielefeld/München: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1954. Pp. xv + 2178-2478.

Majut's article on the history of German fiction from Biedermeier to the present concludes the second volume of the monumental omnibus of German literary criticism, *Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß*. It fills 281 columns of text, a great deal of which is set in small type (obviously a printer's device, because there seems to be no particular principle behind its application): in short, here we have a history of modern German fiction of impressive proportions.

Whether or not we agree with Majut's approach, we must admit that he has managed an unwieldy topic with dexterity; where he is successful, he is superb. Perhaps we should pity him for having had to wade through such morasses of fiction, substantial parts of which are of little interest except to the sociologist (and often enough the pathologist); what must have been misery at times, however, was totally self-inflicted and could have been avoided by applying a more rigid principle of selection. But Majut has a proclivity for sociology and intellectual history; he tries to combine literary with (in the broadest sense) soci-

ological criteria, with, unfortunately, rather frustrating results. What he achieves is at best a "wechselseitige Erhellung" of literature and society. In his presentation society appears only as far as it is reflected in its literature, and literature only in its relation to society. His limitations show immediately when we compare his study with such an expert piece of sociological investigation of the novel as Ernst Kohn-Bramstedt's *Aristocracy and the Middle Classes in Germany* (London, 1937), a book that is nowhere mentioned by Majut. He himself has characterized his survey as an "ideengeschichtliche Darstellung des Romans" (col. 2328), but it would have been more to the point had he called it a "Darstellung der Ideen an Hand des Romans." Actually, the novel serves Majut merely as source material, and if his findings are correct (which we do not doubt), they could be, and perhaps should be, substantiated by comparable investigations of drama and poetry. The results of such supplementary research would produce the ultimate proof of his theories.

Majut is best known for his work in the field of Biedermeier literature. It is only natural that he should have used the opportunity offered him to sum up his previous studies and to attempt a comprehensive view of the literature of the period. We had every reason to expect that his presentation of Biedermeier and its historical border regions (the transitions into Young Germany and Young Germany itself) would result in an outstanding achievement, and it did. By following through the major lines of literary tradition, he has studied their transformation by the novelists of the period. His evaluation of Stifter, for instance, within the general context, is sound and well balanced; there is no trace of that painful adulation which mars so much of recent Stifter criticism. Very gratifying also is his handling of Gutzkow, which may very well lead to a complete reappraisal of a much maligned author whose work has been drowned in a flood of clichés by literary historians for almost a century.

Perhaps Majut should have confined himself to the nineteenth century, for it is obvious that his categories, cutting through the literature of each period and sub-period, are less adequate for the situation, let us say, after 1890. He must have been aware of this difficulty himself, because he has somewhat modified his approach in the second half of the treatise. While adhering to traditional categories in the first part ("Zeitroman," "Entwicklungsroman," "Frauenroman," etc.), he centered the second part around "Problemkreise" (love and marriage, social problems, decadence, etc.). However, this change in orientation is constantly readjusted to the method used earlier, so that Majut can, for example, speak of "Ansätze zum Entwicklungsroman" in Expressionism where they are all but nonexistent. What is more serious, though, is that in the process of arranging modern fiction by subject matter, Majut has completely disregarded the novel as a work of art. When we return from the last part of his survey to the first, we realize that the same basic difficulty prevails here as well, except that the Biedermeier novel (and just as much the novel of the Young Germans) was in most instances no more than a fairly reliable mirror of the time. The nineteenth-century novel in Germany is, we admit, of strongly sociological significance which that of the twentieth century seems to have lost in the general disintegration of tradition. Here it is everybody for himself, it seems, and we shall have to be infinitely further removed in time from this wild growth of fiction to be able to interpret factually its often obscure sociological implications.

Putting Majut's study aside, the reader may wonder whether it is altogether possible to write a history of fiction without ever asking the simple questions: What is a novel? What are its laws and possibilities? How can we evaluate the creative processes that went into its making? Only if we disregard the aesthetic

angle as completely as Majut does, relying for the artistic appreciation solely on our personal taste, will novels like Arnold Zweig's *Pont und Anna* and Vicky Baum's *Eingang zur Bühne* appear as books which "gehören zum Echtesten und Schönsten ihrer Zeit" (col. 2416), while the majority of Ernst Broch's works are summarily dismissed with the remark "alles von hohem Wert" (col. 2472). We could register many other similar grievances: the total inadequacy in the discussion of Fontane and Kafka, the omission of many names (Hofmannsthal!), when so much space is devoted to trash only because it contains problems that are easily classified.

This is not to say that Majut's presentation of the recent phases of the history of German fiction (all lumped together, from Wilhelminism to the present, as "Realism" with its subdivisions) is without merit. His discussion of decadence in the early twentieth century is excellent and more comprehensive than anything that has been said before. The material gathered so profusely on every page of the study exceeds in volume all similar undertakings. Thus, if the reader wants to know (among other things) who loved whom and how in modern German fiction, he will probably get his information—IF he succeeds in locating it, for there is no index to help him in his search. If, on the other hand, he wants to get a bird's-eye view of one man's work, he will have to turn elsewhere.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

University of Connecticut

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Germanischen Philologie. Neue Folge, Vols. XVI-XIX: *Bibliographie, 1936-1939.* Herausgegeben von der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954. Pp. xxiii + 1052.

Every Germanist will hail the reappearance of the *Jahresberichte*, especially the present volume which contains the bibliography for the years 1936-39. The loss of manuscript materials at the end of the war and the difficulties inherent in rechecking the sources have caused gaps which the compilers readily acknowledge. There are errors both of commission and omission: *MLQ* is listed as a source, although the English *MLQ* was defunct for decades before the present bibliography begins, and our American *MLQ* had not yet started in 1939. But the main thing is that the volume was brought to completion at all, and that the volume covering the war years is being hastened to its conclusion in order to try to bring the bibliography up to date as soon as possible.

CURTIS C. D. VAIL

University of Washington

Rómulo Gallegos: Estudio sobre el arte de novelar. By ULRICH LEO. México: Ediciones Humanismo en Homenaje a Rómulo Gallegos, 1954. Pp. 188.

Ulrich Leo's book is the most significant contribution yet made to the scholarship about Gallegos. That it is the best book that has appeared and yet is on the whole unsatisfactory is a telling comment on the state of Gallegos studies. A collection of five articles, all previously published during 1940-50, *Rómulo Gallegos* represents a smaller proportion of the Venezuelan's total literary output than the title indicates. *Doña Bárbara* figures in two studies: "*Doña Bárbara: obra de arte*," 1940, and "*Doña Perfecta y Doña Bárbara*," 1950; the novels *Pobre*

Negro and *El Forastero* in "La Invención en la novela," 1943; "*Sobre la misma tierra*, Apuntes al estilo de la novela película," 1945; and the early short novels, *La Rebelión* and *Los Inmigrantes* in "Un Maestro en formación," 1945. None of the articles has been revised or proofread, a regrettable failure. Even misspellings of names of characters which appeared in the original articles have been allowed to remain with no indication that such was the case: *Acorta* instead of *Alcorta* throughout "La Invención en la novela"; *Fortunato* for *Remota* (p. 94). Furthermore, typographical errors are to be found on almost every page.

In a prefatory note Professor Leo, a philologist, expresses his hope that his readers will consider the volume as an "ensayo de investigación filológica, ni más ni menos," warning that they will find "ni biografía ni 'crítica,' ni historia literaria sino únicamente interpretación de fenómenos formales y estéticos..." (p. 9).

An interest in aesthetic phenomena does not excuse Professor Leo's cavalier attitude toward acceptable scholarly procedures; he almost never supplies the requisite bibliographical information on the works discussed and to which he gives page references. The notable exception is found in "Un Maestro en formación," where this information is given in the course of a description of his own difficulties in obtaining such data (p. 164). He provides adequate data for *Doña Perfecta*, but the information on *Doña Bárbara* is confined to "según la ed. de Barcelona, s.a." (p. 55), of which there were four within a year of its first publication.

The value of Professor Leo's contribution to Galleguan criticism is evident in his analyses of three chapters in *Doña Bárbara* ("La Dañera y su sombra," "La Pasión sin nombre," and "Soluciones imaginarias") and of the first five chapters in the "Cuarta Jornada" of *Pobre Negro*. The results are not so felicitous, however, when the author subordinates his primary purpose to what he describes as a secondary objective implicit in the subtitle of his volume: "la de investigar, a base de algunos textos analizados, ciertas particularidades constitutivas del arte de la prosa en general" (p. 10). Unhappily, Professor Leo's talents are not of the generalizing sort: philologists classically work close to the text; when they leave the text, they are as liable to error as the next critic. And it is here that Professor Leo runs into difficulties of a sort that the philologist seldom has to face. For example:

Si la novela se debe definir, modernamente, como cuento inventado de cierta extensión, desarrollándose entre personas inventadas cuyos destinos, artísticamente equilibrados, se enredan y desenvuelven hasta cierto punto conclusivo y según la probabilidad [*sic*] anímica, y (en sus niveles elevados) expresando simbólicamente una idea escondida, una vista del mundo o de la vida: *El Forastero* no es novela. (p. 95)

The critic can say one of two things: since the novel can be thus defined, *El Forastero* is a novel; or, although the novel today cannot be defined in these terms, *El Forastero* is nevertheless a novel.

Even more disturbing are the misrepresentations and distortions which originate in Professor Leo's determined effort to prove the validity of his *a priori* theories at the expense of what the novelist has written. Within the limitations of this review a look at his treatment of the novel *Pobre Negro* must serve as a sample of his method.

In this essay ("La Invención en la novela") the author pursues a theory which he describes as "la patología de la literatura" or the phenomenon "de un género literario más bien que otro adaptado a un tema" (p. 10). His postulate is that *Pobre Negro* is not in essence a novel, that it should not have been written as a novel but as "un ensayo de psicología histórica sobre la Guerra Federal vенеzo-

lana" (p. 69), and that Gallegos might have done well to take a long rest from imaginative writing and devote himself to the essay (p. 60). To prove his point Professor Leo does not perform the close textual analysis he leads his readers to expect (see p. 70) but proceeds to rewrite the novel for Gallegos.

The core of the "evidence" which Professor Leo submits is his belief that Pedro Miguel should have died a tragic death "como la única liberación heroica que le sobraba a un hombre heroico, no capaz a forjarse la vida que corresponde a su mérito substancial" (pp. 80-81). The story itself, since it prevents this, is therefore artificially contrived and false and proves that Gallegos should not have attempted the work as a novel. Juan Coromoto, because he did die the "heroic death" which, according to Professor Leo's schema, was Pedro Miguel's "due," forces us to "hasta considerar a Juan Coromoto como al que reemplaza, en la trama artística del libro, al héroe..." (pp. 107-108). Moreover, the faithful ex-slave has thereby usurped the symbolic role indicated by the title from its "dueño," Pedro Miguel. (The full context in which these statements appear, as given in a footnote, is an excellent illustration of the author's method.)

While Professor Leo's emotional involvement with the novel's protagonist is understandable, the weaknesses of such a view appear obvious. Pedro Miguel is indeed a tragic figure, but he is just as obviously not heroic. He is, in fact, a moral coward who seeks to compensate for his illegitimate and mixed racial status by an exaggerated cult of self; who refuses to recognize that the spiritual dependence of human beings one upon another is not a sign of weakness; who, rather than apprehend his own truth and realize himself within his limitations, prefers to withdraw into his autistic and infantile paranoia. When he flings himself into the Federalist War, it is as a means to self-immolation, because he is afraid to take the gift of life which is his for the asking in the person of Luisana Alcorta. Despite Professor Leo's assumption that the "hero" of a novel and its "protagonist" must of necessity be one and the same and that its title be specifically applicable to the protagonist, it would seem that the long and varied history of the genre speaks for itself. The answer to Professor Leo is that Juan Coromoto is the "hero" and the epiphany of the "pobre negro" of the title neither by chance nor mischance but because this is the way Rómulo Gallegos wrote his novel.

It is in such instances of critical myopia, arising from his preconceived ideas of what Gallegos "should write," that the chief flaws of Professor Leo's book lie.

GLORIA ALEDORT

Oregon State College

Lope de Vega: El príncipe despeñado. A Critical and Annotated Edition of the Autograph Manuscript by HENRY W. HOGE. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications, Humanities Series No. 33, 1955. Pp. x + 188. \$4.00.

Although the present reviewer, lacking access to a copy of the autograph, will not presume to discuss the accuracy of Professor Hoge's text, an accurate version of another of Lope's autographs is always welcome. The Introduction is informative, as is most of the material that the editor has supplied; but one feature is somewhat disturbing. Under "Abbreviations" (p. ix), Hoge tells us that "Whenever a play is cited by title alone, that play is by Lope..." and in the Notes so treats *Amar por burla*; *Arminda celosa*; *Contra valor* [no hay desdicha]; *Enmen- dar un daño* [a otro]; *La esclava de su galán*; *La esclava de su hijo*; *Los Gus-*

manes de Toral; La intención castigada; El jardín de Vargas; La ley ejecutada; La mayor desgracia de Carlos V; Los nobles como han de ser; El palacio confuso; El saber puede dañar; Santo Angelo; and El silencio agradecido—all of which Messrs. Morley and Bruerton have considered more or less doubtful. (S. Griswold Morley and Courtney Bruerton, *Chronology of Lope de Vega's comedias* [New York, 1940]; and "Addenda to the Chronology of Lope de Vega's comedias," *Hispanic Review*, XV [1947], 49-71. The pages just cited, by the way, are given in Hoge's edition [p. 181] as 50-71. The authors and their book will henceforth be called MB, and their article, "Addenda.")

MB flatly reject Lope's authorship of *Amar por burla* (pp. 255, 374), *Enmendar un daño a otro* (pp. 280, 375), *La esclava de su hijo* (pp. 282, 375), *El jardín de Vargas* (pp. 297, 375), *La mayor desgracia de Carlos V* (pp. 308, 375), *Los nobles como han de ser* (pp. 319, 375), and *El palacio confuso* (pp. 321, 375; cf. *Academia Nueva*, II, 28b); but some of the explanations seem rather superfluous (pp. 296, 374), *La ley ejecutada* (pp. 301, 374; cf. "Addenda," p. 63), *Santo Angelo* (pp. 339, 372), and *El silencio agradecido* (pp. 343, 372). "Probably by Lope" is as far as they will go with *Arminda celosa* (pp. 259, 370), *Contra calor no hay desdicha* (pp. 269, 371), *La esclava de su galán* (pp. 282, 371), and *El saber puede dañar* (pp. 338, 371). *Los Gusmanes de Toral* is a special case: MB at first accepted it without question, but later decided that the present text is not Lope's ("Addenda," p. 57), basing themselves partly on the findings of Walter Poesse, Professor Hoge's colleague at Indiana University. If Hoge disagrees with the MB opinions, that is of course his affair, and he is entirely within his rights; but one hesitates to ignore these conclusions, in view of their overwhelming accolade from subsequent discoveries during the past fifteen years. Otherwise, the Notes are helpful, as in the discussion of *acción* (pp. 147-48), which, incidentally, Lope also used in *La corona de Hungría* (1623; cf. *Acad. N.*, II, 28b); but some of the explanations seem rather superfluous for the reader to whom this edition is presumably directed. For example, Hoge tells us that "Everyone who has read a *comedia*... is familiar with the metathesis of *d* and *l* in the imperative..." (p. 6); but he takes the trouble to point out that "this type of metathesis is very common in the *comedia*" (p. 142). Another familiar feature of the *comedia* is Alexander as "the symbol of greatness and nobility in Lope" (p. 147; more specifically, of course, he often stands for generosity); and surely most of us know the date of the "día de San Juan" (pp. 151-52). As between the two extremes, however, certainly too much information is better than not enough.

A few slips may be noted. *Amor por burla*, p. 185, should be *Amar por burla*, as it is on p. 142. *Contra valor* [no hay desdicha], cited on p. 159, is missing from the "Index of comedias Cited," p. 185; and *La niña de plata*, mentioned on p. 162, is in *Acad.*, IX, not X. Quevedo's *Casa de locos de amor*, assigned on p. 162 to BAE, XXIV, is correctly located in XXIII on p. 181. Francisco de B. San Román, cited on p. 182, is called Francisco B. de San Román, p. 2, n. 4. Neither the *Casa de locos de amor* nor the *Cancionero de Hernando de Castilla* is a *comedia*, yet both are in the "Index of comedias Cited," p. 185; and one might quibble about the *Aucto del repelón*, p. 185. In the same section, we are not told which part of *El príncipe perfecto* is intended, though we find on p. 156 that it is Part II. *La nueva victoria*, p. 186, is also so called on p. 145; and one must consult *Acad.*, XIII, 74b, to find that the play is *La nueva victoria del Marqués de Santa Cruz*, and not *La nueva victoria de don Gonzalo de Córdoba*. We should not have to search that far, especially since Professor Hoge gives us almost the full title of *El nuevo mundo descubierto por* [Cristóbal] Colón, which

he could have called *El nuevo mundo* with much less confusion for his readers than arises from the *Nueva victoria* reference.

The above reservations aside, it is still good to have another autograph to consult; and we can be grateful to Professor Hoge.

R. W. TYLER

University of Texas

BOOKS RECEIVED

AMERICAN

Carpenter, Frederic I. *American Literature and the Dream*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955. Pp. vi + 220. \$4.75.

Quinn, Sister M. Bernetta. *The Metamorphic Tradition in Modern Poetry. Essays on the Work of Ezra Pound, Wallace Stevens, William Carlos Williams, T. S. Eliot, Hart Crane, Randall Jarrell, and William Butler Yeats*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1955. Pp. 263. \$4.50.

ENGLISH

Adams, Hazard. *Blake and Yeats: The Contrary Vision*. Ithaca: Cornell University Studies in English, XL, 1955. Pp. xi + 328. \$5.50.

Crawford, Thomas. *The Edinburgh Review and Romantic Poetry (1802-29)*. Auckland: Auckland University College, Bulletin No. 47, English Series No. 8, 1955. Pp. 42.

Fraser, Russell A. (editor). *The Court of Venus*. Edited with an Introduction. Durham: Duke University Press, 1955. Pp. viii + 168. \$4.50.

Freeman, Mary. D. H. Lawrence: A Basic Study of His Ideas. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1955. Pp. vii + 277. \$5.00.

Irving, William Henry. *The Providence of Wit in the English Letter Writers*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1955. Pp. 382. \$7.50.

Sisson, C. J. *New Readings in Shakespeare*. Vol. I: Introduction, The Comedies, The Poems. Vol. II: The Histories, The Tragedies. Cambridge: At the University Press, Shakespeare Problems Series, VIII, 1956. I, viii + 218; II, vi + 300. \$8.50 the set.

Starnes, DeWitt T., and Ernest William Talbert. *Classical Myth and Legend in Renaissance Dictionaries: A Study of Renaissance Dictionaries in Their Relation to the Classical Learning of Contemporary English Writers*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955. Pp. vi + 517. \$7.50.

Studies by Members of the English Department, University of Illinois, in Memory of John Jay Parry. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955. Pp. 223.

Williams, Aubrey L. *Pope's Dunciad: A Study of Its Meaning*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1955. Pp. ix + 162. \$3.00.

GERMAN

- Bithell, Jethro. An Anthology of German Poetry. I: 1830-1880; II: 1880-1940. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1956. I, cviii + 212. \$1.50. II, lix + 287. \$1.75. Two-volume set, \$3.00.
- Natan, Alex. Neues Deutschland. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. vii + 151. 9s. 6d.
- Outlines of Programs for the Teaching of German by Television. Committee on Television, American Association of Teachers of German, 1955. Pp. 22. Free of charge from the AATG Service Bureau.
- Stein, Gisela. The Inspiration Motif in the Works of Franz Grillparzer. With special consideration of "Libussa." The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1955. Pp. viii + 223. 9.50 guilders.
- Wardale, W. L. German Pronunciation. Edinburgh: At the University Press, 1955. Pp. xi + 95. 6s.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

- Dagher, Nada Tomiche (editor). Napoléon: Textes inédits et variantes. Genève: Librairie Droz; Lille: Librairie Giard, Textes Littéraires Français, No. 67, 1955. Pp. 205.
- Dante Society. Seventy-third Annual Report. With Accompanying Papers. Cambridge: The Dante Society of America, Widener Library, Harvard University, 1955. Pp. xix + 66.
- Dieckmann, Herbert (editor). Denis Diderot: Supplément au Voyage de Bougainville. Genève: Librairie Droz; Lille: Librairie Giard, Textes Littéraires Français, No. 66, 1955. Pp. clv + 86.
- Gilman, Stephen. The Art of *La Celestina*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956. Pp. ix + 261. \$5.00.
- Herman, J. Chalmers. *Don Quijote* and the Novels of Perez Galdós. Ada, Oklahoma: East Central Oklahoma State College, 1955. Pp. 66.
- Knight, R. C., and F. W. A. George. Advice to the Student of French. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. 108. 6s. 6d.
- Kroff, Alexander Y., and Karl G. Bottke (editors). André Obey: *Noé*, pièce en cinq actes. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1955. Pp. ix + 150. \$2.50.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. Romanische Sprachwissenschaft. I: Einleitung und Vokalismus. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., Sammlung Götschen, Band 128/128a, 1956. Pp. 160 + 20. DM 4.80. II: Konsonantismus. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., Sammlung Götschen, Band 250, 1956. Pp. 95 + 20. DM 2.40.
- McSpadden, George E. An Introduction to Spanish Usage: Basic Elements of Spanish and Principles of Their Use. New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1956. Pp. xvi + 267. \$3.50.
- Navarro, Tomás. Métrica Española: Reseña Histórica y Descriptiva. Syracuse: Syracuse University, Centro de Estudios Hispánicos, IV, 1956. Pp. 556.
- Nitze, William A., and Harry F. Williams. Arthurian Names in the Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes: Analysis and Commentary. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 38, No. 3, 1955. Pp. 265-98. \$0.50.
- Stokes, Samuel. Julian Green and the Thorn of Puritanism. New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1955. Pp. xiv + 155. \$3.00.

Tilander, Gunnar. *Maint: Origine et histoire d'un mot*. Stockholm: Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitesakademien, Filologiskt Arkiv I, 1955. Pp. 64.

GENERAL

Bowers, Fredson (editor). *Studies in Bibliography*. Vol. 8, 1956. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1956. Pp. 275. \$6.00.

Carroll, John B. (editor). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Foreword by Stuart Chase. Published jointly by The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons, New York, and Chapman and Hall, London, 1956. Pp. xi + 278. \$7.00.

Fennell, J. L. I. (editor). *The Correspondence Between Prince A. M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia, 1564-1579*. Edited with a Translation and Notes. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955. Pp. xi + 275. \$6.50.

Hollander, Lee M. (translator). *The Saga of the Jónsvíking*. Translated from the Old Icelandic with Introduction and Notes. Illustrated by Malcolm Thurgood. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1955. Pp. 116. \$3.00.

Kreuzer, James R. *Elements of Poetry*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955. Pp. xi + 256. \$2.90.

Literature and Science. *Proceedings of the Sixth Triennial Congress*, Oxford, 1954. International Federation for Modern Languages and Literatures. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Pp. xiii + 330. 45s.

Parry, Thomas. *A History of Welsh Literature*. Translated from the Welsh by H. Idris Bell. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955. Pp. xii + 534. \$8.00; 50s.

Runes, Dagobert D. *On the Nature of Man: An Essay in Primitive Philosophy*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 105. \$3.00.

Schlauch, Margaret. *The Gift of Language*. Corrected, unabridged republication of the 1942 edition entitled *The Gift of Tongues*, published through special arrangement with Viking Press. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1955. Pp. viii + 342. \$3.50, cloth; \$1.75, paper.

Studies in the Renaissance. Vol. I. Edited by William Peery. Austin: University of Texas Press, Publications of the Renaissance Society of America, 1954. Pp. 179. Vol. II. Edited by M. A. Shaaber. New York: Publications of the Renaissance Society of America, 1955. Pp. 189.

Weinstein, Ruth Hirsch (editor). *Report of the Sixth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, Institute of Languages and Linguistics, School of Foreign Service, Monograph Series No. 8, September, 1955. Pp. 195. \$2.50.

Year's Work in Modern Language Studies. By a Number of Scholars. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by S. C. Aston. Vol. XVI, 1954. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1955. Pp. viii + 519. \$10.00; 60s.

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

SEATTLE 5

Brents Stirling
Parrington Hall

Entered at Postoffice as Second Class Matter, Seattle, Washington

